

my

# NAZIANZENI

QUERELA ET VOTUM JUSTUM.

## The Fundamentals of the HIERARCHY examin'd and disprov'd :

Wherein the choicest Arguments and Defences of the most applauded and latest Hierarchick or Prelatick Writers, A. M. D. D. the Author of *An Enquiry into the New Opinions* ( chiefly ) propagated by the Presbyterians in Scotland, the Author of the *Fundamental Charter of Presbytry* examin'd & disprov'd, and many others are sincerely expended, the Plea they bring from *Ignatius's* Epistles more narrowly disscuss'd, many things much enlightening this Controversy, either not at all, or not so fully hitherto unfolded, are, from ancient Church-Writers, and other unsuspected Authors, advanc'd.

By *William Jameson.*

Ὅτε ὁφείλον γε μηδὲ τῷ προεδρία, μηδὲ πρὸς τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ, καὶ τυραννικῇ προνομίᾳ, ἢ ἐξ ἑρῆτης μόνης ἐκινεσθαι. νῦν δὲ τὸ δίδειν τὸ τοῦ ἑξιστάτου, καὶ τοῦ μέσου, καὶ τοῦ ὑπαλλότου, καὶ τοῦ χαμηλώτου, καὶ τοῦ προβαδίζοντος, συμβαδίζον πολλά ποιοῦνται τὰ συντελεσμάτων ἡμῶν διακινῆς, καὶ πολλὰς εἰς βλάβην ὡσεὶ, καὶ εἰς τὴν ἡμῶν ἐκείνων χάραν ἀπώγαλαν.

Would to God there were no Prelacy, no Prerogative of Place, no Tyrannical Privileges, that by Vertue alone we might be discerned. Now this Right and Left Hand, and middle Rank, these higher and lower Dignities, and this Statelike Precedence, have caus'd many fruitless Conflicts and Bruises, have cast many into the Pit, and carri'd away Multitudes to the place of the Goats.

Gregorius Nazianzenus Orat. 28.

G L A S G O W,  
Printed by *Robert Sanders*, for the Author. Anno DOM. 1697.

MAXIMIAN

YHOCARY



---

The Introduction to all the sincere  
Lovers of the Christian, truly Ca-  
tholick, Protestant Principles; and  
the Haters of Romish Dross and In-  
novations, but Chiefly to these of  
the Church of SCOTLAND.



*Can truly say I am so far from loving a Salamandra's Life, the line of Contention, or Controversie for Controversie's sake, as to pray earnestly that all our intestine Heats and Strugglings may resolve into that happy and lawfull Striving, how each of us may best please him that has called us unto Holiness & Peace, and that there be no Provocation, save unto Love and to good Works. My main End is only to Dis-abuse my Protestant Brethren mislead by some who are so uncharitable as to Un-church and Damn the greater and better part of the Reformed, because they imbrace not as Divine that which, at best, is but of Humane Device, and who thus conspire with the mortal Enemies of all Protestants, against these of em whom the common and unsatiable Adversaries most implacably hate: for, above all others, the Presbyterian Puritans (as they speak) are acknowledg'd to be most irreconcilable to the Roman Catholick Doctrine, and on this account, the prime Object of their Malice. This*

*is*

### The Introduction.

*is obvious in the Writings of the Romanists; but chiefly in these of the Jesuites; witness (to name no more) Petavius in his books of the Hierarchy and Appendix thereto, and another Papist the Author of Prestycines Triall, prime Armories whence our present Adversaries fetch most of their weapons. The Papists in this, as in many things else, are followed by the Quakers, as is evident from most of their Pamphlets, but more especially from a pretended Answer to a part of a Book, wherein I gave some further Discoveries than had been already made of the Impieties and Self-contradictions of that Sect. This Answer they (for I do not think that it belongs all to one Parent) name The Plow-man rebuking the Priest: of which I can say, with the Prophet Jeremiah, that I have suffer'd Rebuke for my God's sake; and, with Job, can take mine Adversaries Book on my shoulder, and bind it as a Crown to me, having receiv'd all along thro't, in stead of a Confutation, a most strong Confirmation of the Truth of the Doctrine I propugn'd, and much more ground to abhor the Impieties of Quakerism, and to bless God who hath brought to pass that their very Attempts to palliat their Abominations, prov'd a further Detection thereof. Read, pray, earnestly, and compare it with mine, and you shall find them most frequently yealding the whole Controversy, as also overskiping the marrow of what I had adduc'd, and yet anon triumphing as if they had never, in the least, been guilty of such dealling; you shall find that the most pardonable pieces of their Book are wild Gibberies, extravagant Rove-ries, meer Impertinencies, palpable Perversions, loud Lies, Heresies, Blasphemies, and, in a word, a lump of stuff so Atheisticall, that it proclaims the Authors neither to fear God, nor regard man, never to have consulted Conscience, nor to have remembred of future Judgement, or of the ac-*  
count

### The Introduction.

*count they must give at the tremendous Tribunal of God. Yet all this is but what I expected, and is not unworthy of these, who, with Satan's sworn Slaves, renounce their Holy Baptism, and, therewith, whatsoever is constitutive of a Christian. For a further Manifestation whereof, hear the Quakers themselves, who are now split into Factions; to wit, into Keithians, after George Keith a prime Pillar of Quakerism; and Foxonians, as they're called: These reckon the Keithian Quakers for lost, and call G. K. (a) Brat of Babylon, Apostate, worse than prophane, a Liar, Devil, one that always endeavoured to keep down the Power of Truth, gone into a Spirit of Enmity, foaming out his own shame, without the Fear of God before his Eyes, a Preacher of two Christs &c. Again G. K. (b) who is herein approved by his Keithian Quakers, calls them Fools, ignorant Heathens, Infidels, Liars, Hereticks, rotten Ranters, persecuting Quakers (c); And informs us (d) that no such damnable Heresies &c, are tolerated in any Christian Society as are among many called Quakers. For Example that (e) they deny the Day of Judgement and any Resurrection, but what they have already attained; that they make the Light sufficient without any thing else excluding the Man Christ Jesus, and his Obedience, Death and Resurrection, Ascension, and Mediation for us in Heaven. I am grieved (writes J. Humphrey's (f) to hear some say they expect to be justified by that Blood which was shed at Jerusalem. Wherein, as G. K. shews, he's patroniz'd by not a few. Another great Zealot among the Quakers said, and affirmed boldly (saith G. K. (g) that he expected not to be saved by that which di'd at Jerusalem, to wit the Man Christ. And a-*

(a) Judgement given forth &c. Page 12. (b) Ibid. (c) The Trial of Peter Bosj &c. Page 6. (d) Plea for the Innocent, Page 12. (e) Page 11. (f) More Divisions amongst the Quakers Page 15. [g] Judgement given forth &c. Page 17. and Append. to the History of the Quakers, pag. 16.

### The Introduction.

gain G. K. (b) calls them Pelagians and Deists. And (i) To many of the Quakers (saith G. K.) all are Christians [to wit, Jews, Mahumetans, Painims] in whom any good seed of Religion appeareth, and which they say is from Christ, yea is Christ himself. And (k) Many, yea the most, or rather almost all the Ministers among the Quakers (very few excepted) do affirm, that this inward Light is sufficient to bring forth the new Birth, and to give eternall Salvation, without any thing, without us, that is, without the man Christ that was outwardly born, and crucified and rose again, whom some of their Ministers in my hearing, hath called an outward thing, a shell, a husk, that doth little or nothing profit us, and the Faith of which doth nothing profit us. And William Penn (continues G.K.) in that Meeting at Ratcliff, where he falsely called me an Apostate, did publickly proclaim after this manner: Friends, said he, I see no great need of preaching, the Faith of Christ's Death and Sufferings, for all England and all Christendom hath that Faith, and it doth not profit them. But the Faith which profiteth Men is the Faith of Christ within, and that Friends preach. Let now (saith G. K.) the Author judge, or any other intelligent Person (professing Christianity) whether William Penn hath not sufficiently by these words proved himself an Apostate from the Christian Faith.

Thus you have a taste (for it is no more, compar'd with what I could produce) of Quakerism from the Quakers themselves. Surely most admirable and adorable is divine Providence in so prodigiously strange, and clear a Detection of these infernal Blasphemies and Abominations, from the very Mouths of the chief Actors themselves; to the end, doubtless, that all may hear and fear, tremble and quake indeed to meddle, in the least, with these Quakers,

(b) Ibid. pag. 12. (i) ibid. pag. 17. (k) ibid. pag. 20.

least

### The Introduction.

least God (as is the Lot of these Wretches) by giving them up to so strange Delusions and damnable Lies, make their Plagues wonderfull. May God mercifully grant. (as the Effect of this Discovery) that the sound and stable Christians may regard the Operations of his Hand, and give due Praise to him that preserves them from so deadly an Infection; that the Weak may be confirm'd in their Belief of these Divine Verities which are reveal'd in the Holy Scriptures, and that these who are catch'd in the Gin may yet escape, like a Bird out of the Snare of the Fowler.

But of Quakers enough; only I must repeat that I cannot think my Plow-man to be the sole Author of the Book that bears his Name; no, I think some good part thereof belongs to some, who own neither Name nor Profession of Quakerism. It's true, they hate all Protestants, and chiefly, Presbyterians; yet, there is in that Book something singular, its Author appears rather to have studi'd the blackning and bespattering of Presbytry, than either the Defence or Palliation of Quakerism: for in lieu hereof, I find, in many places, only Libells larded with such Lies, Calumnies, and Slanders, as the more invective Romanists, and other invective Hierarchicks used to throw at all true Protestants, but mainly at the Puritan Presbyterians. There is, moreover, in some places, more plainly express'd, but all along couch'd, yet obvious enough to the observant, a warmth and kindness for these of the Hierarchick, or Prelatical Principles. In a word, much of the Book breaths forth another Species or sort of Malignancy, than is that of Quakerism, a Malignancy peculiar to the Author of Presbyteries Triall, and such professed Romanists; to Heylen and Le Strange, and such barefac'd Papaturians, much rather than to these more fallacious and spiritual Antichristians. Neither can any sensible Man earnestly read their

Book

### The Introduction.

*Book, and not perceive so much. Strange ! Can't they not uphold their Hierarchy, except they thus study to undermine Christianity, and join with its deadly Enemies, and that too with such Varlets of 'em whose Brutishness and molish despicableness, as was the good fortune of Alop's Ass, are their only security, and set them too low for any Man to nottice them ? I'm also inform'd that the pretended Author us'd to have most clos and frequent Converse with an Episcopal Minister of no mean Rank. Moreover, seeing many of the Prelatists oppose the sometimes receiv'd Sentiments, yea and common Articles of the Church of England, for which they pretend such Veneration, by Espousing, with Papists, Quakers, and the like Opposers of Truth, the Tenets of Pelagians, and Arminians, no great wonder tho' they syncretize with such Sectaries against the Presbyterian Calvinians (as they speak) and accordingly the Neopelagian Hierarchicks (for there are Episcopals, surely of a better Mind, and Judgement more Orthodox) make a third Squadron of this unsanctified Army, and in Railing, Antichristian Sophistry, and such unworthy Methods, labour to come short of neither Quakers nor Papists. Such a black Combination would well nigh move one to say of Presbyterians as Tertullian said of Christians, There must needs (saith he) be some good thing among Christians, seeing they were chiefly persecuted by such a Monster as Nero. It's a sign of your greater Glory (saith Hierome (1) to Augustine) that all the Hereticks abhor you. And here I cannot but notice how the Author of The fundamental Charter of Presbytry &c. (having most untruly insinuated, as if we ascribed to our first Reformers an Impeccability, and espoused every particular Sentiment or Expression of every one of 'em, as infallible) no less falsely gives out and earnestly studies to*

(1) Inter Epist. Augustini 25.

*perswade*



### The Introduction.

*perswade the World that all these our first Reformers, and especially Mr. Knox, were nothing but a pack of treacherous bloody Rebels and most odious Men: see, to name no other places, from page 334. to 346. and is not this sufficient Evidence that the Author has a large measure of the Spirit of Ham the curs'd Exposer of his Father's nakedness, but he knows who'll thank him,*

*Hoc Italus velit & magno mercetur Abaddon.*

*The matter is, these Men are much grieved that ever we were fre'd from Rome's Tyranny and Superstition, and so know not how to be even with these precious Instruments of that our most happy and admirable Deliverance. Another of their Arts is that they use boldly to pretend the Doctrine of their Hierarchy to be most Catholick and absolutely necessary, and so Un-church most of the reformed Churches; and, which is no less Un-christian, they strive to support it with such Arguments as equally serve to establish an universal Papacy. Again, they use to English these Romish Sophisms, and yet quite dissemble the Answers and Refutations the Reform'd have giv'n thereto, as, to name no more, is the constant Practice of A. M. D. D. Moreover they now darr to assert, contrary to the acknowledgement of all Men, and the Concessions of the greatest Prelatists, that our first Reformers were of the Prelatical Perswasion. They would possess Men with the same thoughts of the Transmarine Reformers, and therefore, among other Means to effect it, they use to work on the necessitousness or ambition of some forraign Protestants, as the Romanists do on needy Greeks and other Easterns, and bribe them to publish, for the receiv'd Doctrine of the Churches they were bred in, what is quite contrary to their known and common Sentiments and publick Confessions. I only give some Examples of these their Arts (for whocan recount*

### The Introduction.

recount them all) this is certain that if ye ransack and unfold their Methods, you shall find none of 'em without some noteable Cheat and fallacy at bottom. Their Hierarchy leans on three Props, as its fundamental Supporters: The first is their wretch'd perversion of some Scriptures, the second is their Fancy that it still obtain'd in the primitive Church, the third, that 'twas believ'd by all Ages to be of Apostolick Institution. These Conceits are the very Fundamentals of the Hierarchy, which I here examine. and, as I trust, disprove, and accordingly so Intitulat the subsequent Papers. I repeat as little as is possible of what has been said before, and especially meet with the Hierarchys most applauded and latest Asserters, and among these A. M. D. D. and the Author of the Fundamental Charter &c. the far more considerable part, yea the very substance of both which Books I examine and exartuat. I discuss moreover the Plea they bring from Ignatius's Epistles, as also detect most of the foremention'd Artifices together with many such ungenerous Methods not hitherto so fully discovered Hence I hope I cannot be justly accounted an Aggressor or Provoker, nor yet my Papers superfluous: I don't notwithstanding impeach as guilty of these Deallings all Episcopall men, for of these there have been and doubtless now are both good men and stout Protestants, and such, I know, will never be offended if I lay open open the Weakness and unworthy Deallings of such as anathematize whosoever prefer the Model of the prime ptimitive Church-Government, the Apostolick Humility and Simplicity, to their Diocesan Hierarchy, the secular Grandeur of subsequent and more degenerate Times, if I, among many other Demonstrations hereof, bring a Cloud of most competent and unsuspected Witnesses, who depone that during the Apostolick Age and the prime Primitive Church, there was a Bishop for each Congregati-



### The Introduction

on, an Identity of Bishop and preaching Presbyter, and, finally, a compleat Parity of ordinary Pastors; if I make appear that the greatest Enemies to this Truth and Adorers of the Hierarchy are (mangle all their Cunning) compell'd to subscribe and seal it. If yet some hesitate and admire, how then so many of the Learn'd can give their Hierarchy a divine Sanction, or set it so high as the times of the Apostles, such would remember that no fewer, at least, and these of no less Learning, no less confidently pretend a Divine Origin for many things, the Foundation whereof notwithstanding is undeniably in the dust of humane Corruption. How many Torrents of Wormwood hide their little heads in sources in that Christian *Æon* the space of about an hundred years after the Canon of the Scriptures was sealed, whereof so few genuine Monuments now remain, and wherein Christians (as they were also for a good many yeares after that time) being astonish'd at these more prodigious Heresies, and wholly imployed in quelling these Hydras, were kept from watching against more sly and subtle Assaults of the Enemy, the Danger of whose Tires was scarce discernable till they were hardly to be eradicated.

Again, 'tis to be remembred that there are vast Ods between the Cases of the Contending Parties; many things tempt and invite men to patronize the Hierarchy, whereto the other side is not obnoxious: for whosoever confides in his own Parts and Abilities may probably promise to himself a graduall Ascent even to the height of worldly Ease, Riches, and Honour. Did not these and such Motives bias so many men, together with the Liberty Prelacy gives to Heterodox Principles and to licentious Practices, how few should there be found to agent its Cause? On the other hand Presbyterian Discipline they think too rigid against both these Enormities: and as to worldly Encouragements, there's

\*\*

nothing

### The Introduction.

nothing in Presbytry but a mediocrity of Stipend with a hard and perpetuall Labour without any Hope of Ease, Grandor, or more opulent Fortune. I should now have doon, only I can not but expresse how desirable 'twere that living aside our own unscripturall Fancies, the Grounds of these most lamentable Contentions, all of us followed after the things which make for Peace, a d things wherewith one may edifie another. Who would have thought, not many yeers hence when all true Protestants were at the very brink of Destruction, but that the admirable Deliverance God gave us, should have had this most desirable Consequent. How amazing is it that a number call'd Protestants should vent their Spite, Malice and Treason against the most happy Instrument of this our Delivery in Peace, His Majesty King WILLIAM, who is under God, the main Stay of Protestants, whom yet God protects, and I pray may protect, manure all the malicious Machinations of wicked Men. God yet continues to call us to the same Duty of Christs in Concord, to name no others, by terrible Monitors: for at one Quarter we are besieg'd by nominal Theists but real Atheists who ridicule Gods Sacred Word as the product of Rogues or Sots, and explode the Doctrine of the Existence of Angels and Spirits, and consequently of the Being of God the Father of Spirits, as the Dream of some Brainsick Weaklings, and beliew a man of sence: and at another Quarter, by a direfull Combination of Infernal Fiends and wretch'd Mortals. It's pleasant notwithstanding to observe how the latter of these Satanical Machines split and undoe the former: for the well known and confess'd Compacts and Commerce between these wicked Spirits and Miscreants of hum in Rice, and Operations of Demons, and such Effects undenyably proceeding from preternatural and incorporeal Causes are sure Proofs of such immaterial Beings, and so demonstrat

## The Introduction.

*demonstrat the Falshood of what is brouc'd by these abominable Saducees,*

----- aliquisque malo fuit usus in illo.

O how closly ought all of us to joyn in Weeping, Sighing, and Crying, not only for our own Guilt, but also for the such horrible Abominations that be don in the midst of the Land. In the mean while these and a thousand such Mischiefs mostly owe themselves to this Controversy, our Divisions, Ignorance, want of Church-Discipline, and other such its odious Effects. How many, thro' God's Blessing, should that Zeal, Learning and Industry spent for the support of mens unscripturall Conceits, have brought to the Obesence of Christ from both Romanists and open Infidels?

Heu, quantum potuit Terræ, pelagique parari

Hoc, quem Civiles haurerunt, sanguine, dextræ!

Bless'd then in this Case should be the Peace-Maker, wherefore, let all of us Pray for our Jerusalem that Peace may be within her Walls, and Prosperity within her Palaces. Let us also with Tertullian (m) adore the fullness of the Scriptures; which (as Augustine (n) teaches) contain all things neediull either for Faith or Life. The Books (saith Constantine the Great (o) of the Evangelists, Apostles and ancient Prophets, clearly teach us the Mind of God wherefore laying aside hostile Difeords, let us seek from these the Determination of our Controversies. Surely this is a Catholick Principle: Good had it been if the Fathers had as closly stuck to it in Practice as they firmly believ'd it. You assert (saith Optatus (p) to the Donatists) We deny; between your Assertion and our Denyal the Peoples minds Waver; let none believe either you or us, we are all contentious Men, Judges must be sought, if these be sought for among

(m) *Adversus Hereticum.* (n) *De Doctrin Christiana.* Lib.2. Cap.

9. (o) Theodoret, *Hist. Eccles.* Lib.1. Cap. 7. & *Hist. Tripartit.* Lib.2. Cap.

5. (p) Lib.5.

### The Introduction.

Christians, they can be found among neither of the Parties, because the Truth is impeded thro' Partialty; we must seek for Judges from without, if the Judge be a Pagan, he cannot know the Mysteries of Christians; if a Jew, he is an Enemy to Christian Baptism; on Earth therefore there can't be found a Determination of this Controversie: a Judge must be sought from Heavens; but why should we knock at Heavens Gates, when, hearing the Gospel we have Christ's Testament. *And having elegantly compar'd the Scripture to Min's Testament, which is able to determine every Controversie that may arise among his Children, adds, He who left us this Testament is in Heaven; let his Will therefore be sought for in the Gospel as in a Testament: for the things which you now do, Christ forswore before they came to pass. The same Justice and no more do we require in the present Case; we require, with Cyprian (q) that Custom or Tradition which is without Scripture, tho' otherways never so Old, be thrown away as mouldy Errors. Let not the Hope of Emoluments, secular Grandeur, or Power, make Men rack their Wits to Dprave and Detire the Truth, and despise the Apostolick Humility, and Parity. Then (saith Chrysostome (r) speaking of these Apostolick Times, and that by way of Opposition to his own Age) Church-Government was not Honour or Grandeur, but Watching and Care of the Flock. Seeing it's evident (saith Isidorus Pelusiota) how vast a difference there is between the Ancient humble Ministry and the present Tyranny: Why don't ye Crown with Garlands and Ce'brate the Lovers of Parity or Equality? Let not the gay Pageantry of soppish Ceremonies steal away our Hearts from the simplicity of the Gospel. Is such trash worth the patronizing? Niy rather, Let the Sword of God (The're Jerome's words (s) cut off every thing that men, without*

(q) Epist. ad Pompejum.  
*primum Hæzæti.*

(r) In Acta Apost. Homil. 3.

(s) In the

### The Introduction.

the Authority and Teltimony of the Scriptures, have devised and pretend as if they had it by Apostolick Tradition. *Let all such things be broken in Pieces called Nehustan, and, finally, sacrific'd to Truth and Peace.* Whaticever thing God commands us let's observe to do't, and neither add there-to nor diminish from't. *This I'm sure is the old Path, and the good Way wherein if we Walk we shall find rest to our Souls, our Peace shall be as a River, and our Righteousness as the Waves of the Sea, we shall Dwell together in that Brotherly Unity, which is a true Antecedent of Life for evermore. And this I can freely say, is the ultimat Design of Composing and Emitting the ensuing Treatise, and is and still shall be the fervent Prayer of*

Will. Jameson.

---

Nazianzeni

---

1870  
1871  
1872  
1873  
1874  
1875  
1876  
1877  
1878  
1879  
1880  
1881  
1882  
1883  
1884  
1885  
1886  
1887  
1888  
1889  
1890  
1891  
1892  
1893  
1894  
1895  
1896  
1897  
1898  
1899  
1900

# THE CONTENTS. PART I.

## SECT. I.

*The Scope of the ensuing Treatise.*

The ancient Church for no Divine Right of Diocesan Episcopacy. pag. 1;  
The ablett of its late Patrons of no other mind, where Dr. *Sanderfone* is noted. 2  
An examen of the Conveniencies and Inconveniencies of Prelacy undertaken. 3

## SECT. II.

*The Apherifm No Bishop no King difcuff'd.*

Prelacy contributes not a little to introduce Tyranny. Ibid;  
Prelats feveral ways moft hurtfull to Princes, Ibid;  
Presbytry well agrees with Monarchy: where their Charge of Sedition and  
Disloyalty is largely vouch'd to be moft unjust, from the moft applauded  
Writers of our Adversaries themselves. 8

## SECT. III.

*Their Argument taken from Order weigh'd.*

Their strange Improvement thereof. 17  
It equally serves Prelatists and Papists, Ibid,

## SECT. IV.

*The Plea for Prelacy drawn from Unity difcuff'd.*

Diffentions moft frequent where Bishops bore sway. 18  
Unity and Parity harmoniously ledged in one and the same Assembly. 19

## SECT. V.

*The Argument Prelatists bring from antiquity canvass'd.* Ibid.

## SECT. VI.

*The Instance of Aërius condemn'd by Epiphanius prov'd*

*to be unserviceable to our Antagonists.*  
They joyn with the most diligenous of Papists in using this Argument, 21  
† The

## The Contents

<b>The choicest of the Fathers for the Scriptural and Apostolick Identity of Bishop and preaching Presbyter.</b>	21
<b>Epiphanius giveth little Patrocy to our Adversaries.</b>	23
<b>His Injustice to Aetius in this matter.</b>	ibid.
<b>If Aetius was Arrian largely disputed: the affirmative whereof is rendred improbable by the profound Silence of those who were concern'd to have mention dit.</b>	24
<b>The Tractate ascribed to Hesilius <i>περὶ τῆς ἐκείνου πίστεως</i> is judg'd supposititious: wherein there's nothing to be found concerning Aetius. This report of Aetius his Arrianism leans on Epiphanius's testimony alone, whose great Levity and Credulity is universally noted.</b>	25
<b>It is instanc'd in his dealing with the Donatists whom on no good ground he accuses of the same crime of Arrianism.</b>	26
<b>They're absolv'd by Augustine and Optatus.</b>	Ibid.
<b>It's objected that Aetius his commerce with Eustathius of Schastis may give countenance to the report of Epiphanius.</b>	Ibid.
<b>Eustathius tho't a Heretick yet was not Arrian but a Macedonian, who seems rather to have been dangerously shaken then intirely wedded to Macedonianism.</b>	Ibid.
<b>But on supposition of the worst several reasons are brought making probable that nothing can be inferr'd from his commerce to prove Aetius Heretick.</b>	27.
<b>The loss of the Writings of the Ancient and traduced witnesses of truth is lamentable.</b>	Ibid.
<b>The Judgement of Philastrius concerning Aetius related; against whom the Aetians are vindicated from the Crime of Eucratitism.</b>	28
<b>They were fiercely persecuted and why.</b>	29
<b>Between Philastrius and Epiphanius no good agreement. The negative testimony of both Philastrius and Rabanus Maurus against what is delivered by Epiphanius.</b>	30

## SECT. VII.

*No Diocesan Bishops in several ancient Churches.*

<b>This Instanc'd in the Churches of Ireland, of Africk, and of Scotland.</b>	30
<b>The ablest of our Adversaries brought to a sore pinch hereby.</b>	34
<b>Sir George Mackenzie's Epistolary Defence of Prelacy canvass'd: where Bede is vindicated against the Bishop of St. Asaph, and Buchanan and Hobbart Boethius vindicated against Spotswood, to whom the Advocat referred.</b>	Ibid.
<b>That we had a constitute Church before the coming of Palladius evinc'd against both Bishop and Advocat.</b>	38
<b>Our Primitive Doctors why call'd Monks. The cavills of Spotswood and the Bishop of St. Asaph removed.</b>	39
<b>Small power of Prelats for a long time after Palladius.</b>	40
<b>The most memorable result of the Combat between the Advocat and the Bishop of St. Asaph.</b>	Ibid.
	D. M <sup>rs</sup>



## The Contents.

D. M.'s exceptions removed. His negative argument no argument.	43
Blundel vindicated.	44
D. M.'s perversion of <i>Baron's</i> clear testimony detected.	Ibid.
He in vain attempts to deprave, and then to exaltorate <i>Presper</i> himself.	46
Other specimens of D. M.'s unhandsome dealing.	47

## SECT VIII.

### *Prelacy opposite to the Principles of our Reformers.*

The Hierarchy is condemn'd by our Confession.	49
<i>Knox</i> and his fellows are proved to have been most opposite to the Hierarchy.	50
Domination.	Ibid.
The Author of the <i>Fundamental Charter of Presbytry</i> adventures not on our special Arguments.	51
Against whom <i>Knox's</i> great averfness from Prelacy is evinc'd by vindicating of his Letter to the Assembly.	52
And by vindicating of <i>Knox's</i> words and actions at the Installment of <i>John Douglas</i> .	54
And from clear and unsuspected records: where 'tis also evinc'd that the bulk of both Ministers and People were then opposite to Prelacy.	56
This Authors cavills from the meeting at <i>Leith 7</i> ; and from some expressions of the Assemblies canvass'd and annihilated.	60
<i>Knox's</i> antiprelatical judgement demonstrated from <i>Beza's</i> Letter, which is vindicated from this Authors exceptions.	61
Who pretending to make <i>Knox</i> a Prelatist only labours to prove him and our other Reformers self-repugnant Babelers.	62
His ridiculous Sophisms examin'd and expos'd.	66
<i>Knox</i> alloweth no Prelacy to <i>England</i> .	67
He exhorts the <i>English</i> to embrace a Church-government and Discipline altogether Antiprelatical.	69
The Assemblies letter 1566, vindicated from this Authors pretended allowance of Prelacy.	70
<i>Knox</i> acknowledged by the fiercest Prelatists to be truly Presbyterian.	72
Superintendents in <i>Scotland</i> a temporary expedient. The nullity of this Authors reasons to the contrary detected.	76
The falseness of his Gloss of our first Book of discipline largely demonstrated.	77
Superintendency not really inconsistent with parity. This Authors unchristian rally, his overthrowing of the great principle of Hierarchicks are discovered, and his bottomless cavills enervated.	81
The flock of Prerogatives he pretends to have belonged to Superintendents evinc'd to be unserviceable to his design of giving Superintendents a superiority over their Pastors.	81
He at once yields the whole cause, and clastheth with himself. Our first Reformers their opposition to, and hatred of Prelacy's being damnable demonstrated. The	Helvetian

## The Contents.

*Religion and other transmarine Churches opposite to Prelacy as being  
definite of Scripture foundation.* 86

### SECT. IX.

*The foreign Reformed Churches truly Presbyterian.*

The Judgement of <i>Luther</i> and Lutherans,	89
The mind of <i>Calvin</i> and those called Calvinists both in their private capacities, and confessions of the most famous Churches.	90
Specimens of the chiefest objections adduced and removed where the uncandid dealing of our Adversaries is unfolded,	91
Who yet are forced to acknowledge the truth of our assertion.	95
The eminent Opposers of Popery before <i>Luther</i> truly Presbyterian.	96
The first Reformers and body of the Church of <i>England</i> at that time for no divine right of Prelacy where some of <i>Saravia's</i> qualities are noted,	Ibid.

### SECT. X.

*Some of the manifold Inconveniences attending Prelacy briefly mentioned.*

A Spirit of Persecution still attended it,	98
The Principles of Prelacy and practise of Prelatists most schismatical,	Ibid.
It's native tendency to introduce Popery.	99
And to a Papal Domination and enslaving of the Kingdom.	100
The spite and hatred the Hierarchicks shew against our Reformation from Po- pery, their impiety, and affection to Popery.	Ibid.
<i>Dr. Burnet's</i> exceptions from the Regulars their trampling on the Bishops and the dealing of the <i>Papalines</i> at the Council of <i>Trent</i> enervated,	102
Another exception or retortion of this Author cashier'd,	105
Lousiness and Prophanity the constant attendant of Prelacy.	106

## PART II.

### SECT. I.

*Of Ignatius and his Epistles.*

Papists and other Hierarchicks make a fairer appearance from humane than from Divine Writings.	109
A short account of <i>Ignatius</i> and of the Epistles bearing his name,	110
Various Editions thereof.	Ibid.
Our Adversaries now acknowledge to be spurious that they once gave out for genuine: where of the <i>Florentino Copy</i> .	111
Debates among the Learned concerning it,	Ibid.
The unhandsome arts of our Adversaries to free themselves of further dispute,	112
The	The

## The Contents.

The great Confidence they place in *Ignatius*. 113  
 Three Hypotheses laid down, according to each whereof *Ignatius* becomes unserviceable to the Prelatists. Ibid.

### S E C T. II.

*The first Hypothesis, viz. that Ignatius is, at best, interpolated.*

Writings pretending to greatest proximity to either Old or New Testament, carry most manifest signs of spuriousness, in which Divine Providence is observed. 114  
 Their Epistolick *Ignatius's* want of Apostolick Gravity and Humility: his enslaving of the People and flattering, yea deifying of all Churchmen. 115  
*Dr. Pearsons* Exceptions removed. 119  
*Dr. Pins* self-repugnancy. 121  
*Dr. Wake's* Error discovered. 122  
 A brief sum of the Arguments evincing our assertion. 124  
 Other things very early falsely father'd on *Ignatius*. Ibid.  
 His Journey to *Rome* incredible. 125

### S E C T. III

*The second Hypothesis, viz. That the Antiquity of the true Ignatius could not secure him from all Lapses or Escapes, nor serve to prove that there were no declension in his time.*

Whole Churches suerving during the life of the Apostles themselves. They grew worse after their death. 126  
*Papias's* mistakes and multitude of Followers. 127  
 The failings of *Iustine Martyr* and *Irenaeus*. Ibid.  
 The influence they had on the Church. The common mistakes of these times in Practicks no less than in Dogmaticks; which is instanc'd in their debate about Easter. 128  
 Both parties went contrare to the Apostolick practice; which is proved by clear Testimonies of *Iranus* and *Socrates*. 129  
 Their strange conduct in managing this debate, who Metamorphos'd some Apostles into Jewish High-Priests. 130  
 The Credulity and Oseitancy of *Hegesippus*. 131  
 We are to hearken to God before the chiefest of Men. Divine providence observable in the mistakes of the Ancients. 132

### S E C T. IV.

*The third Hypothesis, that there is no real disagreement, but a true concord betwixt the Doctrine of Ignatius and that of the present Presbyterians.*  
 They are reconcil'd by sustaining the Hypothesis of ruling Elders, which Office is vouch'd to be of greatest Antiquity; and where *Ambrose* or *Hilary* is vindicated against *Dr. Field*. 134  
*Ignatius*

## The Contents.

<i>Ignatius</i> most exprefs for the reciprocation of a Bishop and a Pastor of one Congregation	136
Our Adversaries yield the whole Controversy; where Dr. <i>Maurice's</i> Mistake is dispelled.	138
<i>Vindicia Ignatiana</i> destroy their Authors ultimate design.	140

## SECT. V.

*The Objections they pretend to bring from Scripture against the Doctrine now deduced from Ignatius, removed.*

D. M's reasonings for the Diocesan Episcopacy of <i>Timothy</i> and <i>Titus</i> , annihilated	140
No power properly Apostolick ordinary and permanent in the Church.	143
<i>Wilkes's</i> answer to the <i>Jesuites</i> vindicated against their Advocat. D. M,	147
The Office and nature of an Evangelist declared out of the Ancients.	148
D. M's mutilation and perversion of <i>Eusebius</i> .	149
That <i>Timothy</i> & <i>Titus</i> were Evangelists, and not Diocesan Bishops made out from Scripture.	Ibid.
Apostles and Evangelists degraded by the Hierarchicks.	150
Their Arguments for <i>Timothy</i> and <i>Titus</i> their Diocesan-ship houghed by the very Authors in whom they most confide, both ancient and modern.	Ibid.
Their Argument from the <i>Asian Angels</i> several ways overthrown, and D. M's shifts and perversions expunged.	151
<i>Malach. 2. 7.</i> vindicated against Dr. <i>Hammond</i> .	153
His Correction of the receiv'd Greek Copy of Rev. 2. 24. corrected. D. M's strange and wild Gloss.	Ibid.
<i>Salmasius</i> vindicated against him, and the mind of Presbyterians concerning Apocalyptic Angels fully sustain'd by Scripture and Fathers.	154
The best of our Adversaries really acknowledge Episcopacy destitute of Scripture warrant. Dr. <i>Hammond</i> wholly destroys Episcopacy while he attempts to establish it.	155

## SECT. VI.

*Our meaning of Ignatius confirmed from the writings of the Apostles his immediate Ancestors.*

Act. 10. v. 17, 28 vindicated against Dr. <i>Maurice</i> and others who are by the ears among themselves.	157
Philippians 1. 1. vindicated; where the Diocesanists their Dipladiations are exposed.	158
<i>Philippi</i> no Metropolis; where Dr. <i>Maurice</i> his weakness is detected; the fiction of the existence of Metropoles in the Apostolick age exploded by the Hierarchy's truest friends; Dr. <i>Maurice's</i> slippery dealing.	159
The	The

## The Contents.

The first to *Timothy* 3. vindicated against *Bellarmino*, and his Friend *D. M.* 161  
As is also *Titus* 1. 164

### SECT. VII.

*The grand objection taken from the Commentaries of the Ancients.*

The primitive Doctors ( as themselves acknowledge ) were subject to many  
considerable lapses and escapes, 161  
The causes thereof. 167  
Several reasons demonstrating that if ever the Fathers so glossed these texts as not  
to hurt *Diocesan* Episcopacy, they then gave not their genuine sentiments. 168

### SECT. VIII.

*More clear testimonies of the Primitive Doctors against the Divine right of Diocesan  
Episcopacy produced and vindicated,*

The testimony of *Ambrose* or *Hilary*: *Bellarmino's* perversion discovered, 171  
*Petavius's* vain attempts both to exaunderate and deprave *Hilary*, 173  
The testimony of *Chrysostome*. 174  
He's vindicated from *Bellarmino's* depravation. 175  
The testimonies of *Pelagius*, *Sedulius*, and *Primasius*. 176  
*Augustine* vindicated against *Bellarmino* and his Plagiary *D. M.* 177  
Apart of *Jerome's* testimony on the epistle to *Titus* vindicated against the disbe-  
nefit dealing of *Bellarmino* and *D. M.* 178  
No ground to think that ever *Jerome* accounted *James* Bishop of *Jerusalem*. 180  
All Dispensers of the Word and Sacraments are in *Jerome's* account the Apostles  
Successors. 181  
The rest of *Jerome's* testimony on the Epistle to *Titus* vindicated. 181  
His testimony out of the Epistle to *Enagius* vindicated against *Bellarmino*  
and *D. M.* 183  
This doctrine of *Jerome* most catholic and universally received. 183

### SECT. IX.

*The testimonies of Ignatius his Contemporaries and Suppers disproving what our  
Adversaries would force him to speak, and confirming what we have prov'd to be his  
mind, viz, that he cashier'd a Diocesan Prelacy,*

Negative testimonies. 190  
*Clement Romanus's* positive and clear testimonies. 191  
*Petavius's* exceptions met with. 194  
Are these of his Underling *D. M.* 197  
The testimony of *Polycarp*: where *Dr. Pearson's* strange evasion is routed: and  
*D. M.'s* ill-grounded vaporing exploded. 197  
The testimonies of *Erasmus*: where the vanity of *D. M.'s* Romish Cavills is  
discovered and *Blondel* vindicated, 200  
The

## The Contents.

The testimony of <i>Justin Martyr</i> where Dr. <i>Maurice's</i> perversions are detected, as is also the unreasonableness of D. M's. reasons against <i>Justin Martyr's</i> plaine meaning.	204
<i>Irenaeus</i> identifies Bishop and preaching Presbyter.	206
D. M's. Popish querie,	207

## SECT. X.

### *Other Observations and Arguments everflow of Diocesan Prelacy.*

A Bishop is a name of labour, a Presbyter a name of honor,	Ibid
The true notions of the Apostolick and Hierarchick Bishop diametrically opposite one to another.	209
The example of the Apostolick Bishop followed, and the Idea thereof retained by all the true primitive Bishops or Doctors, which is all one with the notion of a laborious Pastor of a Congregation.	Ibid.
This is confirmed out of the Council of <i>Sardica</i> and others of these times, where Dr. <i>Maurice</i> and Dr. <i>Beverige</i> their sly and perverse dealing is discovered.	210
The subjecting of one Pastor or Church to another finally resolved into a Romish slavery.	213
Every Disposer of the Word and Sacraments is a true Bishop.	214
That in the least Village and meanest Countrey-places, where there was a Congregation, there was a true Bishop largely evinced: where Dr. <i>Maurice</i> his exceptions is obviated.	Ibid.
All Bishops equal among themselves; hence their Hierarchy is overthrown.	216
Their Romish argument from the pretendedly uninterrupted succession of Diocesan Bishops enervated.	217
The argument drawn from the lists of Bishops in <i>Rome</i> and such great Cities satisfied; First, From the positions already demonstrated, which are further confirmed: Secondly, From the confessed uncertainty of these lists: Thirdly, From this that in <i>Rome</i> there was at once a plurality of <i>Peter's</i> pretended successors: Fourthly, From this that <i>Peter</i> was never at <i>Rome</i> , which is largely demonstrated: Fifthly, from the evident falsity of the lists of the Bishops of <i>Jerusalem</i> .	218
That the government of the prime primitive Church was truly Presbyterian made out from a cloud of most unsuspected Authors,	225
A proflacy gradually turned into a Papal Tyranny	230
The Ancients kept fast the Foundations of Christianity, but strayed exceedingly in superstitious additions,	231
The Hierarchicks embracing diverse novell Enormities desert the Primitive Church: where <i>Haylen's</i> perversion of the Ancients is discovered: <i>Matthew</i> 20, 25, &c. vindicated. and D. M's Romanism and Judaism detected.	223
The Bishop of <i>Aiace</i> his Christian Discourse unchristianly eluded and slighted by the <i>Trent</i> Hierarchicks,	239

# ERRATA.

pag.	lin.	read
2	7	r. this.
4	23	r. thereto is sufficient.
7	1	r. palpably.
8	10	r. Jac.
14	1	r. the feares of the.
26	33	dele comma.
32		penult. r 158.
Ibid	ibid	r 163.
Ibid.	ult.	r 53.
37	25	dele (y)
59	10	dele as
69	21	r hope of their.
80	25	r is injoynd,
82	32	r life.
84	1	r Act.
85	13	r their.
87	ult.	r disaproy'd.
92	15	r liked.
104	33	r from.
125	7	r leanes.
129	6	r Apostles.
137	13	r breaking on bread.
140	30	r whereon.

pag.	lin.	read
150	28	r Apostles.
168	21	r expositures.
175	24	r other Pastors.
178	5	r in.
184	12	dele that.
185	18	r Apostolical.
186	28	r were.
188	27	adde it.
197	26	dele it.
202	18	r from.
207	1	r our.
214	6	r or.
Ibid.	7	r of.
216	ult.	r are.
217	20	adde acknowledged.
Ibid.	31	r them.
Ibid.	pen.	r de cornu,
219.	20.	r breaks.
223	1	Babylon, and is called a Persian i. e. a Parthian City, and the Metropolis.
237	16	r allowable.
239	28	r would

## ADDENDA

pag. 71. lin. 21.

*But (saith Heylen, Cosmographie pag. 332.) being once settled in an orderly and constant Hierarchy, they held the same untill the Reformation began by Knox: when he & his Affiliats approving the Genevian Plat-form, took the advantage of the Minority of King James the sixth, to introduce Presbyterian Discipline and suppress the Bishops.*

pag. 96. lin. 9.

*What was the mind of the Waldenses & Hussites (saith Voetius speaking of the Opposers of Prelacy, Polit. Eccles. part. 2. pag. 833.) is evident from their most accurat History written by Joh. Paulus Perrinus, which is not extant save in their vulgar Tongues.*

# ERATA.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30	31	32	33	34	35	36	37	38	39	40	41	42	43	44	45	46	47	48	49	50	51	52	53	54	55	56	57	58	59	60	61	62	63	64	65	66	67	68	69	70	71	72	73	74	75	76	77	78	79	80	81	82	83	84	85	86	87	88	89	90	91	92	93	94	95	96	97	98	99	100



---

---

Nazianzeni Querela  
et Votum Justum.

O R,

*The Fundamentals of the*

**HIERARCHY**

*examined and disproved.*

**Part I.**

*Which briefly handles the prime Arguments  
for the Hierarchy, as also some of its  
Concomitants and Qualities.*

**Section I.**

*The Scope of the ensuing Treatise.*



THE purpose of our present Discourse is not directly to handle that much tossed Debate ; if an Office in the Church for Species or kind superiour to that of dispensing the Word and Sacraments hath any footing or warrant in the Word of God ? Neither will this be judged necessary by any who call to mind that many Treatises disproving

A

the

2      *The Fundamentals of the Hierarchy*      Part I.  
the divine right of Episcopacy, as *Stave Damascenum*, and *Reſtius Inſtruum*, have had ſo good ſuccels that, for ought I know, they ſtand intirely without any ſhadow of an Answer. Yea the moſt learned that ever pleaded for the Lawfulneſs of Episcopacy, will not blame us, though we yeeld no Scripture-ground to it, but only conſider it in it ſelf as a thing indifferent; of which mind, among the Ancients, were, not only thoſe who denyed not the exerciſe of his Office to be Lawfull, as *Hierome*; but alſo the very Biſhops themſelves, as *Auguſtine*, all of them founding this Office, not upon *ſus Dominicum*, the Law of God in the Scriptures; but *Ecclēſiaſticam conſuetudinem*, the practice of the Church.

Ald hereto that both Fathers and Councils equally in Opinion and Practice, ſtuck no leſs to the lawfulneſs of *Patriarchat*, than that of ſimple Episcopacy; and yet I believe few among real Proteſtants will either aſſert the Divine Right of this Office of *Patriarchat*, i. e. that it had any Warrant for it in the Word of God; or yet that thoſe Fathers and Councils ſo believed. Which preſent Conſideration furniſheth us with another Argument ſufficient to evince that the ancient Church founded this Office only upon Cuſtom; and, as they thought, Chriſtian Prudence, and not at all upon the Books of the Old and New Teſtament.

§. 2. Neither do the moſt Learned of the Modern Episcopals in the leaſt ſwerve from this Opinion; amongſt whom I reckon D. *Forbes*, who, (a) having, for a while with the greateſt tenderneſs and fear, handled this Matter, propones at length the Queſtion, *If Episcopacy be of Divine Right?* And yet declares himſelf highly diffcultated what to Answer; for abſolutely deny it, he will not: and poſitively aſſert it he dares not: he therefore confounds it with a Synodical Moderation, and then fairly tells us *that it is of Divine Right; becauſe of the general Scripture-Precepts of Church-Order and Decency.* And indeed he carries himſelf all along in this Matter with ſo much nice Caution, Ambiguity and Fear, that he evinces the deſperation of the Episcopal Cauſe, to which to learned a Man could afford no better Defence, than really to deſtroy what he pretends to vindicat.

Neither is the moſt Learned *Biſhop Uſſer* of another mind, who has reduced it to a meer ſhadow, and nonentity.

(a) Iren. Lib. 2. Caput 11.

And

Sect. I. *examined and disproved.*

3

And (b) Willet, though he says that a difference is needfull for Church-Policy, yet affirms, that this cannot be proved by the Word of God, and that in the Apostles times a Bishop and Presbyter were neither in Name nor Office distinguished. And he at large answers all Bellarmine's Arguments to the Contrary. See the Appendix to the second part of the forecited Question. Of this same Judgement is their applauded Hooker (c) viz. that there is no ground for their Hierarchy in the word of God; while he declares himself against all particular Forms of Church-government, and acknowledges that nothing for 'Diocesan Prelacy can be brought therefrom.' The necessity of Policy (saith he (d)) and regimen in all Churches may be held without holding any one certain Form to be necessary in them all. And the general Principles are such as do not particularly prescribe any one, but sundry Forms of Discipline may be equally consonant unto the general Axioms of Scripture. It hath been told them that Matters of Faith, and in general, Matters necessarie unto Salvation are of a different Nature from Ceremonies, Order, and the kind of Church-Government, that the one are necessary to be expressly contained in the Word of God, or else manifestly collected out of the same; the other not so, that it is necessary not to receive the one unless there be something in Scripture for them, the other free if nothing be alleged against them. And the Learned Dr. Stillingfleet is at no small pains to cashier and expunge, among the rest of peculiar Forms of Government. This 'Diocesan Prelacy out of Scriptural-Articles; and not only acknowledges, but also, (e) musters not a few Arguments, whereby to Prove that it hath no Ground in Holy Scripture.

And, Dr. Morton, (f) Though a zealous Defender of Episcopacy; Asserts that Hierome made not the Difference between Bishop and Presbyter of Divine Institution; he assents to Medina the Jesuite, and asserts, that there was no Difference in the matter of Episcopacy betwixt Hierome and Acrius: He avers further that not only the Protestant, but also all the primitive Doctors were of Hierome's mind. And finally he concludes, that according to the Harmonious Consent of all Men in the Apostolick Age, there was no Difference between Bishop and Presbyter, but was afterward introduced for the removal of Schism. And Jewel Bishop of Sarisburie (a Man for Piety, and Ability, Second, I am sure, to few that ever filled an Episcopal Chair) most expressly asserts the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter

(b) Synop. p. p. conti. 5. Quest. 3. Part 2. (c) Preface to his Ecclesiastical Policy. p. 2. 19. and 20. (d) P. 131. (e) In Iren. (f) Apologia Cathol. lib. 1. p. 118. 119. 120.

4      *The Fundamentals of the Hierarchy*      Part I.  
 Here (saith (b) he) Mr. Harding findeth great fault, for that I have translated these words, *ejusdem Sacerdotii*, of the same Bishoprick, and not, as he would have it, of one Priesthood. God woe a very simple Quarrel. Let him take, whether he listeth best: if either of these words shall serve his turn. Erasmus saith, *id temporis idem erat Episcopus, Sacerdos, & Presbyter*: these three Names, viz. Bishop, Priest, and Presbyter at that time were all one. And (i) but what meant Mr. Harding here to come in with the Difference between Priests, or Presbyters and Bishops? Thinketh he, that Priests, and Bishops hold only by Tradition? Or is it so horrible an Heresie, as he maketh it, to say, that by the Scriptures of God, a Bishop, and a Priest are all one? Or knoweth he, how far, and unto whom, he reacheth the Name of an Heretick? Verily (Crisostom saith, *Inter Episcopum, & Presbyterum interest ferme nihil*; between a Bishop, and a Priest, (which is all one with Presbyter) in a manner there is no difference. St. Hierome saith somewhat in a rougher sort, *Audio Quendam &c.* I hear say there is one become so Peevish, that he setteth Deacons before Priests, that is to say, before Bishops: whereas the Apostle plainly teacheth us that Priests, and Bishops be all one. Thus far Jewel.

The Bishops and Priests (saith the famous Bishop Cranmer (k)) were at one time, and were not two things, but both one Office in the beginning of Christ's Religion. And, In the New Testament, he that is appointed to be a Bishop or a Priest, needeth no Consecration by the Scripture; for Election or Appointing thereto sufficient.

In the same MS. (saith Dr. Stillingfleet (l)) it appears, that the Bishop of St. Asaph, Therleby, Redman, and Cox, were all of the same Opinion with the Arch-Bishop, that at first Bishops and Presbyters were the same; and the two latter expressly cite the Opinion of Jerome with Approbation. Thus we see by the Testimony chiefly of him who was Instrumental in Our Reformation, that he owned not Episcopacy as a distinct Order from Presbytry but only as a prudent Constitution of the Civil Magistrat, for the better governing in the Church. And having proved that Whigist, and with him the whole Body of the English Episcopal Divines were of the same Judgement, thus concludes; (m) By which Principles the Divine Right of Episcopacy as founded upon Apostolical Practice, is quite subverted and destroyed.

(b) Defence of the Apology of the Church of England. pag. 121. (i) page 242. (k) Stillingfleet Hen. pag. 392. (l) Iren. pag. 393. (m) pag. 395.

Now

Now judge if Dr. *Sandersone* (n) spoke not without the allowance, ye contrary to the express Mind of his Brethren, when he says that the Difference among the Advocats for Episcopacy is only Verbal, and that all of them, even those who yeeld that it is not of Divine Right, no less than the rest, assert that it is founded on the Example and Institution of Christ or his Apostles.

§. 3. This Discourse therefore shall weigh the Advantages alledged to flow from Episcopacy, that it may appear if it have such Effects as they Promise; As also inquire if the Hurt and Damage does not preponderat all the Good they can pretend to be linked to their Hierarchy. Neither shall we neglect to examine, if what the most Learned of that Perswasion bring from Ecclesiastick Antiquity, be subservient to their Cause.

## Section II.

### *The Aphorism No Bishop No King discuss'd.*

A Chief Argument whereby they would prove the necessity of Prelacy they bring from the great Support which they say it affords to Monarchy. Hence with them *No Bishop No King* is an axiomatic Aphorism, which cannot be readily granted, seeing, to name no more, the charges the Hierarchy stood the King and Kingdom made a dear Bargain. Much was spent in their stated Revenues, but more by their clandestine Exactions, and other sinistrous means of draining the Country, and places of their pretended Jurisdictions, throw which there are Incorporations that, even at this day, groan under the Debts they then contracted: And yet more by sustaining Standing-forces to be Janizaries to the Prelates and their Complices, and persecute the sincerer part of Protestants, for else there was then no use of such numbers. Yet their Maxime may be thus far granted, that Prelacy may much contribute to the introduction of a Despotick and Arbitrary Government: And indeed the great Power they usurped, and manifold Influences they had over both Cities and Country, either to wheedle or menace them to elect such Members of Parliament as pleased them; and

(n) Episcopacy not prejudicial to regal Power. Page 13, 14, 15.

to Cajoile or awe these Parliament-men to speak in their own Dialect: And the being of a good number of them prime Lords of the Articles, whereby they had either the mediāt or immediāt Election of the rest, made them well nigh able to effect no less: Which kind of Government no Wise and Paternal Prince will desire.

§. 2. Moreover that Princes have no great reason to be fond of them is apparent from their great unfitness to manage Politick and State-Affairs.

There are two Ways whereby one may be fitted for being a Statesman; either when Natural induements are extraordinary, which I doubt if many of our Prelats could affirm of themselves: Or else that of Education and continued Industry whereby to be fitted for State-employments; but so far were they from any thing of this, that during their greener years, they had quite other Studies and Employments, being designed for the Ministry; and so were obliged to prosecute hard the Study of Divinity, which, I am sure, will give any Man his handsfull of Work, who makes earnest of it.

From this they are taken to feed some Flock, which, at least, will give them no less exercise. Now, how these Men can be fit for managing State-affairs, or, how they can be well kept from falling into Solecisms therein, whose skill is so small, is not very discernable. But though they were never so well fore-armed for such high State-employments, how find they leisure to exercise them? Is not the Ruling, and Governing so many Ministers and Churches, which they alledge themselves to be entrusted with, a Work heavy enough to exercise, if not to bruise any one Man? Or, where have they found Warrant to relinquish the Ministry, and turn themselves to Offices of State when offered, or to undertake both together? Do they not believe that either of them is heavy enough? Know they not that not only the Apostle, but also the ancient Canons, and, to name no others, these which (though not truly) are called the Canons of the Apostles, most clearly condemn this their Practice?

*Let neither (say they (a)) Bishop, Presbyter or Deacon take upon him any secular Business; otherways let him be cast out off his Office: Hence we may learn, if it be out of Conscience that these Men plead for Antiqui-*

(b) Canon 6. Ἐπίσκοπος ἢ πρεσβύτερος ἢ διάκονος κοσμηκὰς ὀφρυντίδας μὴ ἀναλαμβάνειν τῷ ἐκτὸς μὴ καθ' αἰρήσιν αὐτοῦ.

ty,

ty, when they palpable contemn and trample what themselves count the most venerable Precepts thereof. Moreover it's observable how they, so far as their Interest led them, still studied the ruine of those to whom they owed their Being, as Bishops. Thus the Roman Prelats studied the Ruine of both the Eastern and Western Emperours: Thus the Bishops of Scotland brought no small Vexation to both King and Nobility, in the Reign of *Alexander* the III. And so *Becket* of *Canterbury*, and his Faction handled *Henry* the II of England. But worse did their Successours treat *Richard* the II, whom, in his Absence, they deprived of his Kingdom. It's vain to repute that these were Papists; seeing the ambition of Prelats is well enough known of whatever Name they be: Yea such also have been the Practices of Prelats who acknowledged no Pope, as divers of the Greek Patriarks, who helped not a little to Dethrone their Emperour. And the English Bishops (as *Sir Francis Knols* complains in a Letter to Secretary *Cecil*) encroached not a little upon the Priviledges of the Crown, kept Courts in their own Name, and still give out, that the Complex of their Office, *i. e.* the civil part of it, as well as the other, without any Distinction, was not from the King but from *Iesus Christ*. Which Encroachments are really *Imperium in Imperio*.

On which account, this their usurped Power, as being dangerous, and of a Romish Original, was abolished in the first Parliament, of *Edward* the VI. The Substance of what *Dr. Sanderson* either insinuates or more clearly expresseth in Answer hereto, is, *that this was a Corruption in Edward's Reformation: And that some other Courts in England, as well as these of the Bishops are not kept in the King's Name.* But sure, it's not very credible that this was a Corruption seeing nothing else, since *Edward's* Days, hath been done, during the succeeding Reigns, for that Church's further Reformation; but 'tis an odd Paradox if we consider the Author, for it was *Mary* who Abolished this Act of *Edward*, and restored their Power when she brought back the rest of Popery: And though other Courts, as he says, be not kept in the King's Name, yet reason teacheth, and former experience proves, how dangerous it was to give Ecclesiasticks ought that looks like an Absolute power, and worldly Grandure, whereby, like the Pope, they may, by his Artifices arrive, at length, to a real Independency. And indeed B. *Land*



made large steps towards it, who, as Roger Coke relates, (c) *copt with the King himself, and manag'd both his Will and Authority suſt viſit Colledges not as his Commiſſioner, but by his own Metropolitan right, and plummed (thus ſaith the Author) in his own Feathers, all black and white, without one borrowed from Cæſar whereby the more he aſſumes to himſelf the leſs he leaves to the King, he now ſoars higher.*

And notable here is Dr. *Sanderſon's* diſingenuity, who always gives out that the *Marian Act*, which he ſtill compares with, yea prefers to that of *Edward*, was never repealed by any ſucceeding Parliament. But we are informed by the ſame R. *Coke* (d) *that by the 1. Tac. 25. the Marian Act was repealed and ſo that of Edward revived.* And now to ſee him, who pretends to be a Miniſter of the Goſpel (whoſe Office is only Miniſterial and ſpiritual, exerciſed only in ſpiritual things, without reaching Men's Bodies, inſlicting only Rebukes, and ſuch verbal puniſhments) to ſee ſuch I ſay keeping Courts altogether Civil, and inſlicting corporal mulcts and Puniſhments after the manner of Worldly Potentats, but eſpecially when all this is done in their own Name, would really make the indifferent Beholder averre that ſuch imitated, to the Life, his Romiſh Holineſs, and believed much better his Doctrin of his receiving both ſpiritual and temporal Sword, than that of our Saviour, whereby he prohibited his Apoſtles and their Succeſſours all ſuch earthly Grandure and deſpotick Power, as reſembles the Lordſhip and Dominion of worldly Princes.

§. 3. But their Maxime not only intimats that Prelacy well accordeth with Mouarchy; but alſo, that any other Form of Church-government is deſtructive thereof. Which how they will evince I know not: How they can ſhew that Presbytrie, with which I am only here concerned, is deſtructive of, or in the leaſt inconſiſtent with Monarchy I cannot perceive. They can, I am ſure, neither deduce their Inference from the Practice of Presbyterians, nor the Principles of Presbytrie: Not from the firſt, for though they load them, as if they had been the Cauſe, of many Civil Broyls and Calamities, and eſpecially of theſe enſuing the Year 38. We may juſtly, yea with the allowance of the Hierarchy's greateſt Favourers, reject the Charge, and ſend it home to the Prelats, who, by their attempting to introduce into the Church a Maſs of Romiſh Superſtitious, and their Pride and Tyranny exerciſed on all

(c) *Detection of the Court and State of England.* Vol. 1. Page 361.

Sorts,



sorts, were become unsupportable to both Nobility and People.

B. *Land, Montague* and such Papaturients were then earnestly labouring the reintroduction of a Mass of Romish Leaven into England, though there were but too much there already which had never been cast out. Take one Instance or two in the words of R. Coke a high Church-of-England-man, and no Lover of Presbyterians, I'm sure. *The Bishops* (saith he (e)) of the Province of Canterbury in their own Names, enjoin the removal of the Communion-table in the Paroch Churches & Universities, from the body of the Church or Chancel to the east of the Chancel, & cause Rails to be set about the Table, and refuse to administer the Sacrament to such as shall not come up to the Rails, & receive it Kneeling: that the book of Sports, on Sundays, be read in Churches, and enjoin Adoration. I do not find that Adoration was ever enjoined before, nor any of the forenamed Injunctions in any Canon of the Church. Our Bishops were of the same mettal with these Innovatours in England, and their most docile Schollars: *Land* therefore and his Faction apprehending that we would make but a small resistance against them to whom England was likely to yeeld, prepared for us all her Cup with some other additional Drugs more Romish, than what was obtruded on the English. Witness the Form in the Administration of the Sacrament which (as R. Coke (d) acknowledges) was the same in the Mass. But seeing, the knowledge of the state we were in, when the Nation entred into a Covenant, and opposed that Stream of Romish Abominations, contributes not a little to repell their fierce charges of Rebellion and Sedition; the Reader will pardon me though at some length I transcribe a Passage from one who is beyond suspicion of being partial in favours of Presbytrie, Covenant, or ought of that nature: I mean Dr. Burnet (f) *The Bishops* (saith he) therefore were cherished by him (the King viz.) with all imaginable expressions of kindness and confidence; but they lost all their Esteem with the People, and that upon divers Accounts. The People of Scotland had drunk in a deep prejudice against every thing that favoured of Popery. This the Bishops judged was too high, and therefore took all means possible to lessen it, both in Sermons and Discourses, mollifying their Opinions and commending their Persons, not without some reflections on the Reformers. But this was so far from gaining their Design, that it abated nothing of the Zeal was against Popery, but very much heightened the rage against themselves, as favouring it too much.

(e) Vol. 1. Pag. 361. (d) Pag. 368. (f) Memoires of the D<sup>o</sup> of Hamilton, Pag. 29. 30.

C

There

There were also subtle Questions started some Years before in Holland about Predestination and Grace; and Arminius his Opinion, as it was condemned in a Synod at Dort, so was generally ill reported of in all reformed Churches, and no-where worse than in Scotland: but most of the Bishops, and their Adherents, undertook openly and zealously the Defence of these Tenets. Likewise the Scottish Ministers and People had ever a great respect to the Lord's-day, and generally the Morality of it is reckoned an Article of Faith among them: but the Bishops not only undertook to beat down this Opinion, but by their Practices expressed their neglect of that Day; and after all this they declared themselves avowed Zealots for the Liturgy and Ceremonies of England, which were held by the Zealous of Scotland all one with Popery. Upon these Accounts it was, that they lost all their Esteem with the People. Neither stood they in better Terms with the Nobility, who at that time were as considerable as ever Scotland saw them; and so proved both more sensible of Injuries, and more capable of resenting them. They were offended with them, because they seemed to have more interest with the King than themselves had, so that Favours were mainly distributed by their Recommendation; they were also upon all Affairs, nine of them were Privy Counsellors, divers of them were of the Exchequer, Spotswood Arch-Bishop of S. Andrews, was made Chancellor, and Maxwell Bishop of Ross was fair for the Treasury, and engaged in a high rivalry with the Earl of Traquair, then Treasurer, which tended not a little to help forward their Ruine. And besides this, they began to pretend highly to the Tules and Improvements, and had gotten one Learnmonth a Minister presented Abbot of Lindoris, and seemed confident to get that state of Abbots, with all the Revenue and Power belonging to it, again restored into the hands of Churchmen; designing also, that according to the first Institution of the Colledge of Justice, the half of them should be Churchmen. This could not but touch many of the Nobility in the quick, who were too large sharers in the Patrimony of the Church, not to be very sensible of it. They were no less hatefull to the Ministry, because of their Pride, which was cried out upon as unsupportable. Great Complaints were also generally made of Simoniacal Pactions with their Servants, which was imputed to the Masters, as if it had been for their advantage, at least by their allowance.

They also exacted a new Oath of Intrans, (besides what was in the Act of Parliament for obedience to their ordinary) in which they were obliged to obey the Articles of Perth, and submit to the Liturgy and Canons. They were also dayly making Inroads upon their Jurisdiction

Sect. 2. *examined and disproved.*

II

'diction, of which the Ministers were very sensible; and universally  
'their great rigour against any that favoured of Puritanism, together  
'with their meddling in all Secular-affairs, and relinquishing their Dio-  
'ceses to wait on the Court and Council, made them the Object of all  
'Men's fury. But that which heightened all to a *Crisis* was, their  
'advising the King to introduce some Innovations in the Church by his  
'own Authority; things had prospered so ill in general Assemblies, that  
'they thought of these no more. And in the Parliament 1633. that  
'small addition to the prerogative, that the King might appoint what  
'habits he pleased to the Clergy, met with vigorous opposition, not-  
'withstanding the King seemed much concerned for it; those who op-  
'posed it being sharply taken up, and much neglected by his Majesty,  
'which stuck deep in their Hearts, the Bishops bearing all the blame  
'of it. At this time a Liturgy was drawn for *Scotland*, or rather the  
'English reprinted with that Title, save that it had some Alterations  
'which rendered it more invidious and less satisfactory; and after long  
'consulting about it and another Book of Canons, they were at length  
'agreed to, that the one should be the Form of the Scottish-worship, and  
'the other the model of their Government, which did totally vary from  
'their former Practices and Constitutions: and as if all things had con-  
'spired to carry on their Ruine, the Bishops not satisfied with the Ge-  
'neral High-commission-court, produced Warrants from the King for  
'setting up such Commissions in their several Diocesses, in which with  
'other Assessors, Ministers, and Gentlemen, all of their own Nomina-  
'tion, they might punish Offenders. That was put in practice only by  
'the Bishop of *Galloway*, who though he was a pious and learned Man,  
'yet was fiery and passionate, and went so roundly to work, that it was  
'cried out upon as a Yoke and Bondage which the Nation was not able  
'to bear. And after all this the King (advised by the Bishops) com-  
'manded the Service-book to be received through *Scotland*, and to be  
'read according to the New Book at *Edinburgh* on Easter-day in the  
'year 1637.

Thus Dr. *Burnet*, of which kind much more might be taken from his,  
and the Writings of other Adversaries themselves, and yet far more from  
these of the Disinterested. And now judge under how wofull a Burden  
we then groaned, and if it was not high time for the Nation to curb such  
Tyranny over Bodies and Consciences, and stemm the tide of these

hatefull Corruptions, which not softly and by a stealth, but by violence, like a mighty torrent, were bearing all before them, and at once ready to sweep away both Religion and Property: Should they not by sitting still and quietly yeelding both Sacred and Civil Rights, have proved in the highest degree treacherous to their God, Countrey and Posterity? And seeing the Prelats were either the Authors, or great Promoters of all this Mischief; and the Office it self asserted only upon human-right, and so as a thing indifferent, by its ablest Advocats; and by the King himself (*b*) yeelded to be contrary to the constitution of the Church of Scotland; And, finally, by the body of the Nation held to be unlawful, Tyrannical and Antichristian: Were they not then highly obliged, not only, to censure the Officers, but also to abolish the Office it self? In the mean while, though their Supplications were both most humble and reasonable, yet so had B. *Land* and his Faction mislead and abused the King's Majesty, who otherwise was both Vertuous and Laudable, that the Suppliants were at first answered with terrible Menaces, then with dilatory and ambiguous Speeches, which were seconded with earnest Preparations for a most destructive War, and vengeance on the supposed Delinquents. Nor was ever ought granted but by inches as the urgency of the Courts Affairs compelled them, resolving in the mean while only to gain time, and practise such Artifices untill strength being recovered, the Suppliants, either broken among themselves, or lulled into security, might be overwhelmed at unawares, and with the more ease sacrificed to the fury of the *Canterburians*. As for the black and criminal Actions imputed, during these Times, to the Covenanters (*i. e.* to the body of the Nation, seeing not only the Bulk of the Commonalty, and Gentry, but also the Nobility well nigh to a man, save the Papists, as is acknowledged on all hands, joined in opposing these Enormities) as I shall ever most frankly condemn them when the charge is proved, and doubt not (which falls out in the best of Actions) but that divers who joined them might drive sinistrous Ends; so I averre that all the impartial will distinguish between *Scelus* and *Error*, and ascribe any Escapes or Solecisms, any way chargeable on others, not to their want of Conscience and Loyalty, but at worst to their want of fore-sight: to which byas the odd dealings of the Court, and their want of Experience of these with whom they after-

ward joined, doubtless contributed not a little to incline them. They were not ignorant that King *James* who (as Dr. *Burnet* (i) intimates) opposed Presbytry, not out of Conscience, but *Policy*, rarely minded to keep what he promised; and, at every innovation he introduc'd, a-  
 verr'd that it should be the last, while he only designed to make it a pre-  
 parative for more. And indeed, to name no others, King *James* his pre-  
 varicating, temporizing, promising, and consenting to what he ne-  
 ver mean'd to stand longer than untill by force, he should be able to  
 undoe them, is not altogether conceal'd even by his own *Spotswood* (k)  
 himself, though rarely, I acknowledge, guilty of so much ingenuity.  
 Neither made he any bones to obtrude on this Kingdom inquisition-  
 like High-commission-courts, without any Law (l) or *Acts of Parlia-*  
*ment.*

These his steps were trodden by his Successour, who, being Prepos-  
 sessed by the *Canterburians*, with all imaginable severity, urged and in-  
 creased these lawless Innovations, and yet stuck not to averre that he  
 took Arms only to suppress Rebellion, and not to impose Novelties (m). And  
 that all Concessions then given were only to gain time, till sufficient  
 strength to overwhelm this Kingdom, might be recovered, is not only  
 colligible from the more impartial Accounts of these Times, but also  
 from *Nelson* himself. The King (saith he (n)) was prevail'd with, by this  
 reason offered by *Traquair* to sign the following Instructions. That his Majesty  
 notwithstanding whatever the Parliament could do, might, whenever he was in  
 a better Capacity, introduce Episcopacy, because the Bishops being by all the  
 Laws of Scotland, one of the three Estates of Parliaments, no Act that passed  
 without them would be of force, much less an Act for their Abolition, especial-  
 ly they not appearing or consenting to it, but protesting against it. Now, as the  
 same *Nelson* relates, In these Instructions the King allows his Commissi-  
 oner to consent in his Name to the abolishing of Episcopacy when it  
 should be enacted by the General Assembly. And now judge what strange  
 Policy this was, which left the King at Liberty to null all Acts of Parlia-  
 ment wherein Bishops had not a Vote, even tho' himself had ratified the  
 Abolition of Episcopacy, and added never so positive a Sanction to these  
 Acts made without Bishops, which presuppos'd his Ratification of  
 their Exclusion from voting in Parliament. Now I say, such strange

(i) Memoires Page 29. (k) Hist. Page 447, 453. (l) Memoires  
 Page 47. & alibi (m) Memoires Page 60. (n) Collections Vol. 1. Page 245.

dealings as these, and thereupon the dreadful Effects of the Court's fury, so soon as it could gather strength to exercise them, might prompt Men to an extream sheinels of believing any of its Promises, and incline them to a closser Conjunction with these of whose Arts they had less Experience. And doubtless when they made the League with the English Parliament, they were far from believing that some of them drove such Ends as afterwards appeared, and far from foreseeing (as certainly were many of the *then* English Parliament) the dismal Alterations which ensued; otherwise certainly they had never join'd with the English or done ought of that kind. And indeed, as to their second entry into *England*, Dr. *Burnet* (i) ingenuously demonstrates that it was well nigh impossible for them at that time to do otherways. Moreover that the Crime of Selling his Majesty is falsely imputed to the State or Church of this Nation, and that they abhor'd and detested so wicked a Parricide as was committed on his Royal Person, may be attested even by the greatest of Royalists themselves; whereof, their Reception of, and standing for King *Charles* the II, and that in opposition to Antimonarchicks, untill they together with him were broken by the prevailing Enemy, is a sufficient evidence.

And as I shall not defend the separate actings of some call'd the Associates, so I say that every just Estimator of these Affairs will, after serious reflection, be ready, at least, to excuse and pity them; seeing they not only had fresh memory of the scarce parallell'd dealing of the preceding Reign, but also perceived evident Specimens of a strange Genius in the Successor; whence they might collect how sad and terrible things might be feared from him, should he be permitted to give the reins of Affairs to the Popish and other Incendiaries, whom even at that time he was observed most to favour; and if his subsequent Actions have not given these too much to say for themselves, I leave to the judgement of the unbiass'd. However things be, seeing these were but a handfull never approv'd by the body of the Nation, or the most part of Presbyterians therein, their doings cannot in the least infringe the instance. Another instance is that of the Presbyterians their assisting and preserving of King *James* the VI in his Minority.

But now put case many foul and unjustifiable things might be objected, and these their Actions accompanied with many Circumstances and



Concomitants not to be defended; yet how levels this at the core of the Controversie? *Jam dic Posthume de tribus capellis?* Let them either speak to the purpose, or acknowledge their extravagancies: It's evident, and we prove, yea even from their own most approved Writers, that then, Liberty, Religion, and all morality was struck at and well nigh overwhelmed; the Body of the Nation jointly oppos'd themselves, that they might stop the Torrent. Now the Question is, if this was Lawfull and well done? and with this they rarely dar meddle, or if they do, it must be on presupposition of pure passive obedience, without any exception, and of other such Hypotheses as not only equally level at the Reformation of most of the Churches from Popery, but also transform regular Monarchy into an absolute Tyranny, ruine all Subjects, and at length prove really destructive of what they pretend to advance: either I say they must use these or the like Hypotheses, and so give what is well nigh nothing to the purpose, or else adduce what is wholly forraign thereto, and only load our stout and worthy Opposers of that Mass of Romish Superstition, Irreligion, and Prophanity, with most heavy Accusations, as false and perfidious, acting from bad and base Motives, using unworthy Methods, driving sinister Ends, and thus only endeavour to bespatter and blacken their Adversaries, not to handle the Controversie: And this minds me of what I have observ'd in some of the Popish Historians, and others of their Declaimers against our first Reformers, for their bad cause permitting them to speak little or nothing directly to the Purpose, and their Malice allowing them as little to be silent; they spend most of their Harangues in decrying and reproaching all who were active in that Reformation as guilty of many foul personal Blemishes, acting nothing sincerely but out of base Principles, and to as ill Designs: and amongst other things is chiefly objected the Crime of Rebellion, whereon the Romanists most commonly expatiate: and some of them add much about Conspiracies between these Reformers and the *Turk* against the Catholics as if *He* had been at the bottom of most was then done: just as our Adversaries make *Cardinal Richlieu*, and the *French*, the Authors and chief Promoters of our opposing *Laud's* Popish Innovations: surely the former is less ridiculous and carries more colour of possibility than the latter. In the mean while it will make their Calumnies of less Credit with all true Protestants, that they load *Knox* and the rest of our first Reformers with no less black detraction



tion and Under, than they do these of the 38, accusing and condemning them of an anarchick and ungovernable Temper, hatred against all Kings, Faction and Rebellion: and on this false pretence they breath out their malice and bitterness against them, and that no less fiercely than they do against the Opposers of the *Canterburian* Incendiaries. And thus much of the Practice of Presbyterians.

Neither have they any more reason to alledge the second, that the Principles of Presbytry are contrary to Monarchy, none of them yeelding any such Inference. Their peculiar Hypothesis wherein they oppose Prelacy is, *that no Pastor ought to usurp a Dominion or Superiority over his Brethren*: And how this Principle can induce any to attempt the everſion of Monarchy, is not easily conjectured.

They have yet another Principle, *that whoſoever is call'd to the Ministry ought not to intangle himſelf in any Civil Affairs, but to lay out himſelf wholly for the Souls of Men, and to this end be inſtant in ſeaſon and out of ſeaſon*: Which is conſonant enough to the former, but oppoſite to the Principles of Prelats; who aſſert that Civil and Eccleſiaſtick Offices are compatible, and may be lodged in the ſame Subject: and accordingly they graſp and inſance whatſoever Places of State they can come by, both of higher and lower degree. Now, whether that Government which is only Miniſterial, not, if they hold to their Principles, concern'd with Politicks, or Civil Government, but only with the Souls of Men, for the Edification of whom all their Studies are directed; or that which is pompous and deſpotick, allowing Church-men to climb unto the higheſt Places of State, be moſt oppoſite to Monarchy, let any Man judge. And although the Prelats acknowledge dependance upon their Prince, they but only do what the Popes did, who for a long time acknowledged their dependance upon the Emperour, and fought their Election or the Confirmation thereof from him, untill by little and little they got to ſtand upon their own Legs to, almoſt, the overthrow and ruine of their Sovereign and Benefactor. Now, Prelacy and Popery being really one and the ſame Government, Princes ought to fear no leſs Miſchief from the one than from the other.

Section

## Section III.

*Their Argument taken from Order, weighed.*

**A**Nother Achillean Argument they bring from the Nature of *Order*, which, they say, is wholly inconsistent with *Parity*. Hence one of their *Coryphas* brandishing it, to the end he might compleat the Demonstration, cited *Aristotle* himself for the Definition of *Order*, which (saith he) is *secundum quem aliquid altero prius aut posterius dicitur*. For that unhappy word *simul* would have spoil'd the whole Business, and therefore must be left out. And certain it is that none of them can improve this Argument any more than he has done, seeing, according to the express Definition of *Order*, a *Parity* is no less consistent therewith than *Superiory* and *Inferiority*.

§. 2. Moreover if this Topick do them any Service, it shal, at length, establish a Pope over them all; seeing a *Parity* of superior Officers, as Bishops or Arch-bishops, is no less Cyclopick and Monstrous (for with these names they calumniat Presbytry) than a *Parity* of Pastors. Yea by this their Argument it is manifest how they reproach most of the reformed Churches, as if there were nothing there but a Babylonish Confusion; and the Apostles themselves, none of whom, I think, took the Oath of Canonical Obedience to another. Moreover, whosoever denies a *Parity* in a plurality of Governours (tho' the chiefeest in a Society) as if 'twere unwarranted by Example, and tending to Confusion, discovers either his Ignorance, or what is worse; seeing it is well known that at the same time there was a plurality of Kings in *Sparta*, of *Ἀρχοντες* or Princes in *Athens*, and of Consuls in *Rome*; during which Governments there was, I am sure, as little Disorder as when they were in the Hands of one single Man. So much is really affirmed by their own learned *Sutlivius* (a) who brings store of such Examples, and irrefragably evinces our Purpose: so true it is that none can smartly oppose the Pope's Crown, but must *eâdem operâ* (were he, as indeed *Sutlivius* is, the greatest Friend to Prelats) ruffle also their Mytres.

(a) *De pontif. Rom. lib. 1. cap. 8. Præterea exercitus non semper unum habet ducem, &c.*

D

SECTION

## Section IV.

*The Plea for Prelacy, drawn from Unity, discuss'd.*

NO less fiercely do they argue that Episcopacy is altogether necessary on the account of *Unity*; *Without which* (say they) *there can be nothing but Schism and Division*; and therefore the *Ancient Church* sustain'd it. But altho' this might have deceiv'd some of the Ancients, whose ends were good (though this mean fell out ineffectual, yea unhappy whereby to obtain them) yet it is strange that any now, if at all they reflect on past times, can place any confidence in such Church-policy, in order to procure Peace and Unity: seeing it is of all things most undeniable, that, notwithstanding hereof, the primitive Church was oppress'd and rent with innumerable Schisms, hatch'd and sustain'd by Bishops, in opposition to Bishops; no less, at least, than by Presbyters, in opposition to Presbyters. Yea it is certain that these, whom they contend to be Diocesans, were either the Inventors, or, at least, the main Propagators and Abettors thereof. Were not *Victor of Rome*, and *Polycrates of Ephesus*, the Authors of that great Schism and Controversie anent the Celebration of *Easter*? Were not *Stephen Bishop of Rome*, and *Cyprian of Carthage* Authors of another Schism about Rebaptizing of the lapsed? Was not *Paulus Bishop of Samosata*, Author of that non-such Schism and Heresie of the *Samosatenians*? Did not the mighty Schism of the *Donatists* fall out because *Sicilianus* Competitor with *Donatus* was prefer'd? And, when the Heresie of the Bishop of *Samosata* was varnish'd by a Presbyter *Arrinus*, how was it hugg'd and propagated by the bulk of the Oriental Bishops? Was not *Macedonius*, Bishop of *Constantinople*, the Author of that most damnable Heresie known by his Name? Again *Nestorius*, Bishop of that same City, gave both Being and Name to another Schism no less dangerous than the former. Time would fail me to reckon up *Berillus*, *Bostrensis*, *Nepos* an Egyptian Bishop, *Fidus* in *Africk*, *Photinus* of *Syrrium*, with many others. And in short, few Heresies or Schisms sprang up in these Times, but they had either

Sect. 4. *examin'd and disprov'd.* 19  
either Bishops for their Authors, or else for their great Abettors; without whose influence, they were likely shortly to have starved : or else they were raised through the Pride and Competition of men aspiring to the Episcopal Dignity; which, to name no others, is clear in the Instance of *Donatus*. Yea that *all the blackest Schisms and most pestilent Heresies had Bishops for their Authors*, *Smlivius* (a) expressly affirms.

But take one Instance further, in respect of which the rest are but Grasshoppers, in the Person of the *Romish Bishop*, or Bishops; who have been the great Authors and Fomenters of the most damnable Heresies, and mighty Schisms, that the Christian World hath hitherto seen. Certainly, had the Church contented Herself with the Apostolick Parity we plead for, the Man of Sin could not have mounted the Throne of Iniquity; on which, for many Ages, he hath continued to the most pestiferous Infection and distracting Division of the Church, that ever Satan did excogitat, or Man behold.

§. 2. Moreover, suppose they could with the greatest plausibility conclude the inconsistency of Unity and Parity, they were yet to be neglected; it being certain that, in the choicest Assembly the World ever saw, both of'em were harmoniously lodged; and that there are Christian Churches enjoying no less Harmony without *Diocesans*, than those who have 'em.

(a) *De pontif. Rom. Lib. 2. Cap. 10. Nalla enim in Ecclesia Dei graviora excitata sunt Schismata, nec Hereses exorta sunt ab ullo tetiores quam ab Episcopis.*

---

## Section V.

*The Argument Prelatists bring from Antiquity, canvass'd.*

THEIR next Plea is from Antiquity : but for us it may be enough to say from the Beginning it was not so. Thus Christ answer'd the Pharisees: thus the Christians answer'd the Heathens alledging the Antiquity of Gentilism. They can give few or no Proofs for their Proposition from the first, and best part of the second Century : They pretend

indeed to the Epistles of *Ignatius*, which, to say the best, are in divers places spurious, carrying Self-contradictions, vain Boastings and Flattery all along; but of this more afterward.

Other Catalogues and Memorials of the Bishops of the ancientest Times, were written long after, when Prelacy had got a higher ascendancy, and the Mystery of Iniquity was more palpably working: therefore these Authors spoke according to, and in the Style of their own times, and not in the Style of the times wherein these Pastors lived. And here I say nothing, but what is vouch'd by Dr. *Stillingfleet* (a). And, amongst many others, these his words are most observable: for having taken notice that *Eusebius* makes it a most hard Matter to know who succeeded the Apostles in the Churches they planted, adds, say you so? is it so hard a Matter to find out who succeeded the Apostles in the Churches planted by them, unless it be mention'd in the writings of Paul? What becomes then of our unquestionable Line of Succession of the Bishops of several Churches, and the large Diagrams made of the Apostolick Churches with every one's Name set down in his Order, as if the Writer had been *Clarenceaux* to the Apostles themselves? Is it come to this at last that we have nothing certain but what we have in Scriptures? And must then the Tradition of the Church be our Rule to interpret Scriptures by? An excellent way to find out the Truth doubtless, to bend the Rule to the crooked stick, &c. Again it's certain that, for divers Centuries, Bishops were nothing like what they are now, either in exercising Civil Power, or Jurisdiction over other Pastors, or yet in the largeness of Dioceses; so that the Term *Bishop* in respect of the two is little better than an equivocal. It's certain also that the ancient Church wanted not her own Blemishes: which was well perceived by her Doctors, who still look'd on the Word of God only as the Rule of Faith and Manners, on which they never founded the Episcopal Superiority. Hence this their Argument carries nothing of Cogency.

(a) *Iren.* Part 2. Chap. 6.

Section

## Section VI.

*The Instance of Aërius condemn'd by Epiphanius, prov'd to be unserviceable to our Antagonists.*

**T**O Illustrat and Corroborat this their Argument from Antiquity, they adduce the Instance of *Aërius*; who was for this his Judgement of Presbytry, as well as for *Arrianism*, condemn'd and counted Heretick by *Epiphanius*. But it is certain that *Epiphanius* censur'd *Aërius*, not only for his being Anti-episcopal, and, as he believ'd, because *Arrian*, but also for his rejecting of *Lents*, *set* and *Anniversary Fasts*, and for denial of *Prayer and Sacrifice for the Dead*. Now either purer Antiquity join'd with *Epiphanius* in asserting of the necessity of Prayer and Sacrifice for the Dead, and other such Fopperies; or they did not; and if they join'd with him therein, then our Prelatists, if they be Protestants, are concern'd to reflect better of how little weight their Argument from the Ancients, pressing their unwarrantable Additions, can be unto them: But if they say that sounder Antiquity consented not to *Epiphanius*, while he urged *Prayer and Sacrifice for the Dead*, and such Anti-Scriptural Fictions, we return that neither did the choicest of the Ancients agree with him in his Plea for Prelacy.

The Judgement of *Hierom* is so well known herein, that the Bishop of *Spalato* (a) acknowledges that *Hierom* can by no means, yea not byforce be reconcil'd to their Cause. *Hierome's* Judgement (saith *Saravia* (b)) was private; all one with that of *Aërius*, and contrary to the Word of *GO D*, wherefore we shall examine his Arguments. And on this account he is much offended with *Hierome* accusing him of *Vanity*, (c) *Self-contradiction* (d), and *Prevarication* (e);

(a) De Repub. Ecclesiasticâ. Lib. 2. Cap. 4. Numb. 46. *Sunt qui Hieronymum in vestram sententiam vel invitum velint trahere*—neque in hoc aut excusari satis potest, aut &c. (b) De diversis gradibus ministrorum Evangelii. Cap. 23. *Dico privatam fuisse Hieronymi opinionem, consentaneam cum Aërio &c.* (c) Ibid. 27. (d) Exam. tract. de triplici Episcopatu. Page 25. (e) Ibid. Page 34.

And *Alphonsus de Castro* (f) sharply reproveth *Thomas Waldensis* another Papist, who had intended to pervert the Testimonies, which are commonly alledg'd for Presbytry out of *Hierome*: There *De Castro* having prov'd, out of divers places of *Hierome*, that he was truly for the Scriptural and Apostolick Identity of Bishop and preaching Presbyter, concludes, against *Waldensis*, that of necessity there must be another way taken to Answer the Passages alledg'd out of *Hierome* for Presbytry: And at length fairly opposes himself to *Hierome* in this Matter, and saith, *that we ought rather to believe the Decrees of Popes and Councils, than the Doctrine of Hierome, though both very Holy and Learn'd.*

And *Medina*, another Champion of the Hierarchy, cited by *Bellarmino*, asserts the same of *Hierome*, saying, *He was of the same Judgement with Aërius in this Matter.* *Bellarmino* (g) is very displeas'd with his Brother for his Ingenuity, and therefore attempts to bring *Hierome* over to the Episcopal Party; but instead of performing this Task, he only fruitlessly endeavours to set *Hierome* at variance with himself.

The like success had another of the same Fraternity, who, like *Bellarmino*, attempted to draw *Hierome* to his Faction, *Bayly* the Jesuit: (h) And yet with these, the most disingenous of the whole fry of Loyolites, some called Protestants stick not warmly to join themselves, and plead for a Patrociny to their Cause from *Hierome*.

§. 3. Yea not only was *Hierome* of the same Judgement anent Episcopacy with *Aërius*, but also, as even the Jesuite *Medina* acknowledges, the most of the Greek and Latine primitive Doctors, and in special *Ambrosius*, *Augustinus*, *Sedulius*, *Primasius*, *Chrysostomus*, *Theodoreus*, *OEcumenius*, *Theophilactus*. This their Opinion (*sauit Medina*) was

(f) Contra Hereses fol. 103. B. *Sed revera fallitur Thomas Waldensis quoniam in toto illo decursu post verba proxime citata nihil aliud conatur Hieronymus quam ut ostendat ex Divina Institutione non esse differentiam inter Presbyterum & Episcopum*—*E* fol. 104. D. *Nec etiam mirari quisquam debet quid Beatus Hieronymus Vir aliqui doctissimus sic deceptus fuerit, &c.* (g) De Cler. Cap. 15. *Michaël Medina*—*affirmat sanctum Hieronymum idem omnino cum Aërianis sensisse, neque solum Hieronymum in ea Heresi fuisse, sed etiam Ambrosium, Augustinum, Sedulium, Primasium, Chrysostomum, Theodoretum, OEcumenium, & Theophilactum, atque ita (inquit Medina) isti Viri aliqui Sanctissimi & Sacrarum Scripturarum consultissimi, quorum tamen sententiam, prius in Aërio, deinde in Waldensibus, postremo in Johanne Vviclefo, damnavit Ecclesia. Et infra. Ergo in Hieronymo & Gracis illis Patribus &c.* (h) Catechism. tract. 2. Quest. 23.



SECT. 6. *examin'd and disprov'd.* 23  
 first condemn'd in Aërius, then in the Waldenses, and lastly in Wicklef, but  
 this Doctrine was either dissimbled or tolerated by the Church in them for the  
 Honour that was had to them, while on the other hand it was always condemn'd  
 in these Men as Heretical, because in many other things they swerv'd from the  
 Church. Many Papists and other Prelatists cannot away with this Me-  
 dina's free dealing, and use many shifts to refute him, and draw these  
 Fathers to their Party. But to use the Words of Ruvet (i), Whosoever  
 shall consider their Answers collected by Sixtus Senensis Biblioth. lib. 6.  
 annot. 319, 323, 324. they shall presently perceive that all their Distinctions  
 are most pitifull Eversions, and that indeed all these Fathers were no less Presby-  
 terian than Aërius, although they accommodat themselves to the Custom then  
 received; least for a Matter not contrary to the Foundations of Religion they  
 should have broken the Unity of the Church. What do our Opposits here-  
 in, but espouse what the Romanists, in whom any ingenuity remains,  
 have long since disowned?

§. 4. But 'tho' Epiphanius were the mouth of all Antiquity, and  
 the only fit Judge in this Controversie, the Triumph of our Adversaries  
 should be very small: for Aërius to Prove the Identity of the two, hav-  
 ing adduced a parallel of many particulars, Epiphanius (k) denieth  
 nothing of these to belong to Presbyters, except only Imposition of Hands;  
 he yeelds therefore that both of them equally have Power to Baptize, to occu-  
 py the Chair, and finally to perform all Divine Worship. Our Antagonists  
 therefore offering to vouch the Prelacy they plead for, by the Authori-  
 ty of Epiphanius, promise much more then they can perform; for what,  
 pray, is this Power of Imposition of Hands, or Ordination, compar-  
 ed with what they covet, and pretend to support by Epiphanius his Au-  
 thority, I mean the, both great and many Differences between Bishop  
 and Presbyter.

§. 5. In the mean while Epiphanius his unjust dealing towards Aërius,  
 is most palpable, for he sticks not to give out, that Aërius his Judgement  
 of the Identity of Bishop & Presbyter, was look'd on by the whole Church  
 as an intolerable Heresie condemn'd by the Word of God, when yet the  
 quite contrary is so plain in the Writings of the Ancients down from the  
 very Apostles, that even Epiphanius himself could not be ignorant there-  
 of. Neither are his Deductions from Scripture more solid than his Al-

(i) Cath. Orth. Tom. 1. Page 286. (k) Heresi 55. sine 75. *καί ποτε τῶ ἐν αὐτῷ Ἐπισκόπου, — τί μὴ γὰρ ἐστὶ πατέρας ἡγουμένων τὰς ἐκκλ.*

legation of the Suffrages of the Catholick Church, is true: all he brings from Scripture being 1 *Tim.* 5. 1. and 19. but he so grossly abuses these Scriptures that even *Spalatenus* (1) himself, and the ablest Patrons of Prelacy are ashamed of these Inferences. But *Epiphanius* had less exposed himself, had he, as he did in the Matter of *Lents, set Fasts, Prayer and Sacrifice for the Dead*, and other such his dear and beloved Doctrines, pretended only to Tradition; and so the Lettice should have been fitted for the Lips, and also his miserable weakness have been less apparent.

§. 6. And though in the last place, to render Presbytry more odious, they still upbraid us with the *Arrianism* of *Aërius*; we need be little concern'd therewith, seeing we have the greatest Opposers of Arrians, intirely Aërians (to speak in the stile of our Opposits) in the matter of Presbytry, as we have already shewed. But I must here add, that it is upon no good Ground believed that ever *Aërius* was *Arrian*: all the Schisms and Divisions, though but very small, among the Arrians themselves are diligently described by the Historians of these times, as *Rufinus, Sozrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, Theodorus Leclor, Philostorgius*, and others; but none of these or any others mention a word of the Schism of *Aërius*, which if we believe *Epiphanius*, was a Schism among the *Arrians* themselves: for he tells us that *Eustathius Bishop of Sebastia in Pontus, from whom Aërius made the separation, was a down-right Arrian, and persisted therein till his Death.*

Add hereto that *Augustine* and others, who, in their Catalogues of Hereticks mention *Aërius*, still in their Preambles, intimat that their Author is *Epiphanius*. I name *Augustine* on the vulgar supposition that he is the Author of that tract *de Heresibus*, which yet is very doubtfull, seeing it's altogether improbable that he ever heard off, & far less read *Epiphanius* his books *ΚΑΤΑ ΑΙΡΕΣΕΩΝ* It's altogether unprobable that they were then translated, and it's certain that *Augustine* was utterly unable to understand them in the Original. Moreover, we have in that Tract Relations of the *Nestorian* and *Eutichian* Heresies, not broached till after *Augustine's* Death. Which Relations, altho' some alledge to have been added by another to the rest, which they think to be really *Augustines*, yet seeing they are no less then the rest handed down under his Name (tho' they now stand there as an Appendix, for in the end of

Sect. 6. *examin'd and disprov'd.* 25  
 the *Pelagian* Heresie which is the last before the Appendix, he promises more) make a good proof that it's not easie to discern the genuine part of that Tractat from the Spurious. However this be from what is said, the matter of *Aërius* resolves into this Issue, that we have only the report thereof from *Basilus*, and *Epiphanius*.

§. 7. But that discourse of *Basilus*, ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΑΓΙΟΥ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ, in which *Aërius* is mention'd, is suspected & well nigh condemn'd by *Erasmus* (m) And to confirm what he asserts, *Robert Cock*, in his Censure of the Fathers, adds divers Reasons, as I am inform'd by *Rivet*, (n) for I have not perus'd *Cock* himself; neither need I, seeing in all that Tractat there is not the least mention of *Aërius*. The ground of some mistake was, that instead of *Aëtius*, who indeed was a most noted and pernicious *Arrian*, by the escape of the Printer, or some other accident, the word *Aërius* had crept into *Erasmus* his Translation thereof: But in the Original, printed at *Paris* Anno CIO IO XVIII, there is *Aëtius*, not *Aërius*. They have (saith he (o)) a certain old Quibble from *Aëtius* the head of his Heresie. And indeed *Basil* could never have term'd *Aërius*, or any thing said by him, ancient, seeing he was scarcely so old as *Basil* himself. As for *Epiphanius*, if we consider the Passion wherewith he manages the Debate with *Aërius*, and his great credulity of whatever might favour his own Cause, and his many Mistakes in Historical Matters, he deserves little Credit in this Matter. A mighty Tide of Passion, which both blinds Mens eyes, and opens their Ears to false Reports, visibly appears in *Epiphanius* his whole conduct of the Dispute with *Aërius*: and that he was most credulous, believing the most light and groundless Reports, and in matters of Fact, of all men most frequently fell into Mistakes, is attested, not only by *Melchor Canus*, and *Baron*, in many places of his Annals, among the Papiſts; but also by the learnedest of the Protestants, as *Casanbon*, (p) whose words are: *Epiphanius was a great Man, but, as is very evident, he did most easily believe every most silly and groundless Report.* To which also the learned *Rivet* assenteth.

(m) Epistola ejus dedicationis translationi suæ præfixa. (n) Critic. Patrum Page 330. (o) ΠΕΡΙ ΤΟΥ ΑΓΙΟΥ ΠΝΕΥΜΑΤΟΣ. cap. 2. ἐστὶ δὲ τὴ αὐτοῦ παλαιὸν σόφισμα, ὑπὸ Ἀετίου τῷ προσῶτῳ τῆς αἵρεσεως ταύτης ἐξευρηθὲν. (p) *Vir maximus Epiphanius, sed, quem res arguit ipsa, se vidibus auditu inculis, nescio unde acceptis, facili nimis aliquando fidem habuisse.*

§. 8. One Instance whereof appears in his Relation of the *Donatists*, whom, either out of misinformation, or some other weakness, he accuses also of *Arrianism*, and tells us (q) that they agreed with *Arrius* in Doctrine, and that one Refutation would serve for both.

§. 9. *Augustine* (r) indeed speaks as if some of them believed the Son to be less than the Father: But, as appears from the same Author, (s) they erred rather in expression than reality; for he presently absolves them from the Charge, and informs us, that between the Church and them, there was no Question concerning this Matter. And elsewhere, (t) he imputes this dangerous Expression to *Donatus* their Leader, who had used it in some of his Writings, but tells us withal that his Party follow him not herein. Neither (saith *Augustine*) shall ye readily find one among them all who knows that *Donatus* had any such Opinion.

And *Optatus* (u) plainly declares, that in the great Foundations of Christianity, there was no difference between the Orthodox and *Donatists*. And indeed it is acknowledg'd by all, except *Epiphanius*, that the *Donatists* were only guilty of Schism, not of Heresie.

§. 10. But *Airius* (they may object) his *Arrianism* is sufficiently attested by what is recorded of *Eustathius* his Friend and Bishop: and indeed *Basil* (x) accuses *Eustathius* of *Arrianism*, but for ought I remember the Historians of these times differ from *Basil*.

§. 11. They accuse *Eustathius* of Levity, Deceit, Macedonianism, or the denial of the Holy Ghost's Divinity, a most damnable Heresie, yet different from *Arrianism*. And herein also they represent him rather variable and unfixed, than intirely wedded to this Heresie. He once subscrib'd to the Orthodox Doctrine, and was approv'd as such by *Liberius* the Bishop of Rome, then Orthodox, and other Catholick Christians. But they write that he relapsed. In the mean while, when he was most for the Macedonians, he said as he would not call the Holy-Ghost God, so he durst not call him a Creature; hence, he may rather be counted among these who were most dangerously shaken, than a down-right Macedonian; and may for all is said of his Opinions plead for some Charity from all that well consider, the most dismal and dangerous Age wherein he lived.

(q) *Hzeresi* 39. vel 59. τὴν δὲ πίσιν καὶ τὸν Ἀρειὸν θεωροῦσιν ἀνα-  
τραπήσονται διὰ αὐτῶν περὶ πίστεως— (r) *Epistola* 50. ad Bonifacium. (s)  
Ibidem. (t) *Tom*, 6. *Hzeresi* 69. (u) *Lib*. 3. Page 101. (x) *Epist*. 74.

§. 12. But

§. 12. But let him be an Arrian blacker than *Arrius* himself, it will be hard thence to draw any Conclusion concerning *Aërius*.

For First, *Basil*, in the forecited place, tells us, that *Eustathius* was so cunning, as to perswade the ablest of these times that he was Orthodox; and why might he not then put a Cheat on his own Presbytry.

Secondly, *Eustathius*, as is related, was much given to Covetousness, and altho' *Epiphanius* carri'd out with Passion, for his Innovations justifies and praises him, that he may reach a harder Blow to *Aërius*: yet this his Avarice was one of the Grounds wherefore *Aërius*, (as he professeth) deserted *Eustathius*: and this I think is no less to be believ'd, than ought else we have from *Epiphanius*, uncharitably at least, wresting both his Words and Actions. And it is not improbable that he, who had the Conscience to dislike *Eustathius* for his Vices, might do no less on the account of his Errors.

Thirdly, *Aërius* was priviledg'd by God with, both, eyes to perceive, and courage to oppose the unwarranted *Festivals*, superstitious *Fasts*, *Prayer and Sacrifice for the Dead*, and other such then growing Dottages, notwithstanding that they were so kindly imbrac'd by most Christians. Now I believe that hardly an Instance can be adduc'd, of any who set himself in Opposition to the whole World, by condemning such growing Corruptions, and attempting at least to stop the beginnings of *Anti-christianism*, and yet fell into this damnable Heresie wherewith they brand *Aërius*. I hope therefore, that henceforth all true Protestants shall enlarge their Charity, and be more backward to join with Romanists in bespattering the memory of him who did amongst the first declare his Detestation of the leaven of *Romanism*.

§. 13. Had any thing written by *Aërius*, come unstain'd to our hands, I doubt not but we had got a far other account of his Creed and Doctrine: but the Zeal of these Innovatours prompted them to make all Opposers of their Fopperies grand Hereticks, and sally stigmatize Truth's Witnesses with what really deserved that name, and then overwhelm'd them with Calumnies; and gave their Writings to the Flames for a Repository. This was the Fate of *Vigilantius*, *Claudius Taurinensis*, and others, of whose Writings nothing, except some mangl'd and deprav'd scrapes found in the bitter Invectives of their most partial and disingenuous Adversaries, remains.

§. 13. The *Aërians* are also remembred by *Philastrius* (y) They are so named (saith he) from *Aërius*, they give themselves to abstinences, and live mostly in Pamphilia, they are also called *Encratites*, i. e. *Abstinent*. They possess nothing; They abhorre *Meats* which God with his Blessing hath bestow'd on Mankind: They condemn moreover lawfull Marriage, alledging that it's not of God's Institution. Thus *Philastrius*.

§. 14. But to me it is not probable that any who deni'd, and despis'd all their *Lent-seasons*, *Xerophagies*, wherein nothing was eaten but dry Bread, and such rigorous Fasts and restraints, were ever addic'ted to *Encratitick* abstinences, whereby all use of Wine, Flesh, and other such Delicacies was prohibited.

Secondly, *Epiphanius* makes the *Encratites* and *Aërians* quite contrary Sects to one another, who sustained quite contrary Doctrines and Practices: for according to him (z) the former ate no living Creature, nor drank Wine. Which is also Attested by *Eusebius* (a), and *Irenaeus*. (b) The latter *Epiphanius*, (c) according to his custom of turning all the *Aërians* their Practices into Crimes, will have to be excessive Gormandizers, and but to liberal to themselves in both Flesh and Wine: so far was he from joining with *Philastrius* in ascribing *Encratitism* to the *Aërians*.

Thirdly, Another of the Heresies of these *Encratites*, was their rejecting much of the New Testament, and in particular the Epistles of *Paul* (d). But so far were the *Aërians* therefrom, that they founded (e) the Doctrine, for which they are so much reproach'd by *Epiphanius*, viz. that of the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter, on these very Epistles of *Paul* citing 1 Tim. 3.4. & 14. And the like places of *Paul* for Proofs of their Doctrine, which afterward was done by *Hierome*, and after him by the stream of Interpreters of these Places, and others that handled that Subject, and at this day by the Body of the Reformed Churches.

(y) *Harlesi* 25. *Aërii* ab *Aërio* quodam sic appellati sunt, qui abstinentiis vacant &c. (z) *Harlesi* 27. five 47. ἐμὴν ψυχὰν ἢ βδελύσσομαι. — οἶνον ἢ ἑλὸς ἢ μετὰ λαοὺς βέλονται. (a) *Hist. Eccles.* Lib. 4. Cap. 29. καὶ οὐκ ἐλάττωσαν τὰς αὐτοῖς ἐμὴν ψυχὴν ἀποχρῆν ἐισπυρῆσαντο &c. (b) Lib. 1. Cap. 30. (c) *Harlesi* 55. five 75. αὐτοὶ ἀπέθεντο ὁλωνκεῖν κρέα τε καὶ οἶνον ἰανυρῶν, τὰς ἐλάβας χιμίζοντες. (d) *Eusebius Eccles. Hist.* Lib. 4. Cap. 29. βλατοσημῶντες ἢ Παῦλον τοῦ Ἀποστόλου, ἀθετοῦν εὐσεβῆς τὰς ἐπιστολάς &c. (e) *Epiphanius Harlesi* 55 five 75. οἱ αὐτοὶ εἰς αὐτὸν τὰ φωνῶν καὶ ἢ αὐτὸ ἀκρόνουν ὅτι ὁ Ἀπόστολος γράφει Πρεσβυτέρους, καὶ Διακόνους, καὶ ἢ γράφει Ἐπισκόπους. καὶ τὰ Ἐπισκόπων φησι. μὴ ἀμεινὸν τὸ ἐν σοὶ χάρισμα σοῦ, ἢ ἐλάβας διὰ χειρὸν τὸ πρεσβυτερίον.

From



Sect. 6. *examin'd and disprov'd.*

29

From all which is evident the falsehood of what *Philastrius* alledges, and that the *Aërians* were far from being guilty of *Encratitism* or such Crimes, but they must needs first suffer the persecution of tongues as a preamble and preparative to make them a Prey more obnoxious to the violent hands of these who are beginning to dote on the Romish Superstition.

§. 15. And so it fell out. For *Epiphanius* (f) himself tells us, that the *Aërians* were banish'd from Churches, Lands, Villages, and Cities, and that often times they lodg'd only in the open Air, all covered with Snow, and were oblig'd to seek shelter in the Woods and Rocks. Now what was the cause of this so violent hatred and hot Persecution? Was it their being guilty of *Arrianism*? Sure not: For if we believe *Epiphanius* they were a branch of the *Arrians*, and, as he insinuates, liv'd among them. But suppose they did not, we find no such Persecution of the *Arrians* on the account of their Faith in these times, but only their Exclusion from the publick Churches. They being permitted in the mean while to keep their Conventicles in privat Houses, even at the very Gates of the greatest Cities. Add hereto (which we trust we have evinc'd) that *Aërius* never *Arrianiz'd*, and so they could not persecute him, and his Followers upon this account. From all that is now said, 'tis clear, that we must seek another spring of this violent Hate and Persecution. And this I think may easily be reach'd and perceiv'd to be nothing else but the passionate Zeal, the World, declining more and more after Anti-christian Superstition, had for their set *Lent-seasons*, their *Fasts* of their own making, *Prayer and Sacrifice for the Dead*, their despotick Hierarchty, and other such preparatives of the Man of Sin's appearance, all which were oppos'd by *Aërius*, and his Followers with more Zeal than they were by any others in the World at that time, and so had presently War made upon them by such as minded nothing more than worshipping the Rising-Sun of Unrighteousness. And indeed to me the whole strain of *Epiphanius* his Discourse clearly intimats, that not *Arrianism* but the opposing of these Dotages was the Ground of all this Hatred and Spight that was pour'd upon *Aërius* and his Adherents.

(f) Ibidem ἀπαλύνετο ὁ αὐτὸς καὶ τῆς αὐτῆς ἀπὸ τῶν Ἐκκλησιῶν καὶ ἀγροῶν, καὶ καὶ μὴ, καὶ ἐν ἄλλων πύλαις. πολλὰ καὶ ὁ μετὰ πολλὰ ὄχλησεν ἰδίῃ νι-  
εὐδῶν, ἀγροῶν δὲ τίλει, καὶ αἰσχροῖσι, καὶ ἄλλοις πύλαις, ἐν ὕλαις καὶ ἄλλοις  
ἵστοις.

E 3

§. 16. And



§. 16. And now I have done with *Philastrinus*: only I must observe, for which I mainly adduc'd him, that in him there's no mention of *Aërius* his *Arrianism*, which, tho' a negative Testimony, yet exceedingly weakens that we have from *Epiphanius*, *Philastrinus* being a Bishop, a Man of Credit, and of no less Antiquity than the other. In which Sentiment, I am confirm'd from *Rabanus Maurus* (g) Bishop of *Mentz*, who only informs us, that the Heresie of *Aërius* consisted in despising *Sacrifices for the Dead*. From all which to me it's more than probable, that there's no ground to believe that ever *Aërius* Arrianiz'd.

(g.) De instit. cler. Lib. 2. Cap. 58. *Aëriani ab Aërio quodam nuncupati sunt, hi offerre sacrificium pro defunctis spernunt.*

## Section VII.

### *No Diocesan Bishops in several Ancient Churches.*

THO' their Argument brought from Antiquity, be already satisfi'd, we shall yet give some Instances of Churches, which, for several Centuries, were really without Diocesan Bishops. *St. Patrick*, the Irish Apostle, is commonly said to have ordain'd several hundreds of Bishops in *Ireland*, who, I'm sure, could not be Diocesans. *Dr. Maurice*, (a) being displeas'd with this Instance, rejects *Nennius*, the Author from whom we have the account of *St. Patrick's* ordaining 365 Bishops, as fabulous. But it's not in their accounts of the numbers of Bishops, but of the Deeds and Miracles wrought by Bishops, and others of their Saints, that the fabulousness of the Writers of these times is commonly to be observ'd.

He next quarrels with the common reading of that Author, alledging that *He speaks only of the Bishops in France and Britain, in communion with St. Patrick, not of his Irish Bishops*. But, I think, we may, in such critical Learning, give Bishop *Usher* the Preference, who (b) neither judg'd this Book fabulous, nor its common reading to be suspected.

(a) Defence of Diocesan Episcopacy. Page 153. (b) Of the Religion of the Irish. Page 59.

And

And this account of the great number of Ancient Irish Bishops, is strongly confirm'd by what *Clarkson* (c) cites out of *Bernard* and *Bacon*, shewing that there were well nigh as many Bishops as Churches. This the Doctor passes over in silence, which was scarce fair enough dealing. Neither can the Doctor's ordinary *salvo*, viz. that the Practice was not generally approv'd, nor of primitive Constitution, here serve them; for whatsoever differ'd from the Roman Model, was presently made a Novelty. And tho' *Bernard* and *Lanfranc* dislike the Practice of having so many Bishops, yet they adventure not to instance any time wherein the *Irish* had been rul'd by a few Diocesans. And lastly, the Authors most remarkable herein, inform us that this Practice of having so many Bishops had place even in *St. Patrick's* time, and meer infancy of the *Irish Church*.

§. 2. Most visible footsteps of this also appear in the *African Church*, during the time of *Cyprian*; for in that Council of *Carthage*, where he presided, there was no small number of Bishops conven'd, tho' doubtless there were many more Bishops in *Africk*, who could not be all Diocesans, seeing few then were Christians in *Africk*, save a small part of the *Roman Colonies* only. Yea the hamlets and villages, these Bishops had for their Jurisdictions, are so obscure, that the learn'd *Pamelius* is at a stand where to place them. And, long after, in the time of the *Vandalick Persecution*, as *Victor Uticensis* relates, (d) there were in the *Zeugitan* or *proconsular Province* alone 164 Bishops: others reckon more. Now this was but a small part of what the *Romans* possess'd in *Africk*, and few, beside the *Roman Colonies*, were at that time Christian; for the *Moors*, or old *Africans*, who, beside what they had in the Cities, possess'd almost the whole Country, are by the same *Victor* without exception, call'd *Gentiles*; and many of the *Romans* themselves had not yet imbrac'd Christianity. Now subduce, from that small number of the *Zeugitan Province* who were Christians, the many *Arrians*, and other Hereticks, and Schismaticks, whom these Bishops did not reckon as a part of their Flocks, and surely there shall scarce be found so many as to make up above 164 Parishes. Dr. *Maurice* tells us (e) that all the *African Bishops* in *Cyprian's* time, could not have suppl'd the *Dioceses* of one Province, in the V or VI Century. Which, if true, is a strong Con-

(c) Primitive Episcopacy. Page 40. (d) Lib. 1. Unde factum est ut post obitum Carthaginis Episcopi Zeugitanae, & proconsulari Provincia, Episcopus interdicere ordinarius quorum erat numerus 164. (e) Page 164.

firmation of what we plead for, viz. that they then were nothing less than Diocesans: seeing as is now evident, there were, even in the fifth Century, but a very small number of Christians in *Africk*, compar'd with the rest of the Inhabitants. And in *Cyprian's* time, it may well be judg'd that there were some hundreds of Bishops in the *Roman Africk*, But in such Cases, not the extent of Bounds, but number of Souls is to be considered. Wherefore he should be a wild Reasoner, that should conclude from *Africa's* having a dozen, or such a number of Bishops, or Pastors, for surely there were but few at the entry of Christianity, that there needed be no more afterward, and so make that number the Standard to discern how many Bishops, by primitive Right, were to be plac'd in all *Africa*.

And this is a Kin to what he says (f) elsewhere, *that tho' there were Bishops in small Towns, this was not the primitive State of the Church*; it may be indeed; nor yet, at the first entry of the Gospel, were there Bishops in most part of the great Towns: but was this for fear of Multiplication of Dioceses? no surely; but these few were all could be then gotten. The substance of his Answer here is, that *Africa was most large, fertile, populous*. The first of which is readily granted, but the second not so easily, much of these Regions being more fertile of sand and Serpents than of Corn and Wine: and this in part discredits the third; seeing so much as was barren, is not to be suppos'd Populous; wherefore it's surprising to find him making the Old *Roman Africk* more Populous than *France* is now. He (g) supposes that *Africk had but 500 Bishops, and yet might have 40000 villages*. But I answer, that if the villages were considerable, and had Christian Inhabitants, for otherways this is nothing to this purpose, then had *Africk 40000 Bishops*: for *H. Thorndick* (h) acknowledges that Bishops in *Africk* were so plentiful, that every good village must needs be the Seat of an Episcopal Church. Which words of *H. Thorndick* are cited by *Clarkson* but dissembl'd by the Doctor. In the mean while, I can find nothing which can shake what I have said above, or overturn, as for example, what I have noted from *Vislor's* words, and oblige me to lessen my subtraction. Add to what is said the words of *Dr. Burnet*. In *St. Augustin's time* (saith he (i)) *it appears from the journals of a Conference he had with the Donatists, that there were about*

(f) Page 185. (g) Page 165. (h) Right of Churches, review Page 153. (i) Conferences. Page 348.

five

*five hundred Bishopricks in a small tract of ground.* But we need not cross Seas in pursuit of ancient Churches free of Diocesans, seeing our Country Scotland affords us so luculent a proof of our Assertion. The words of *Prosper Aquitanicus*, in his Chronicle annex'd to that of *Epsebius* and *Hierome*, are most clear and cogent. Palladius (k) is ordain'd by Pope Cælestine for the Scots that had already believ'd in Christ, and is sent to them to be their first Bishop. Never was a passage of any Historian more universally believ'd, than this of *Prosper*, which *Beda* (l), and a *M. S.* Chronicle of Scotland in the Library of *Glasgow*, yea the whole stream of Historians repeat and approve: but none more amply and plainly, than Cardinal *Baron* (m), whose words are, *All Men agree that this Nation* (viz. Scotland) *had Palladius their first Bishop from Pope Cælestine.* And again (n) thus you are instructed how to refute those who alledge that *Sedulius* the Christian Poet, whom Pope *Gelasius* so much extolls, had for his Master, *Hildebert* the Arch-bishop of the Scots: for, seeing even *Sedulius* himself liv'd in the time of *Theodosius* the Emperor, how could he have had, for his Master, *Hildebert* the Arch-bishop of the Scots, seeing there was no Arch-bishop yet ordain'd in Scotland, and *Palladius* is without debate affirm'd to have been the first Bishop of that Nation. This is yet more plainly express'd by the most learn'd Antiquaries of our Country: all of them agree in this, that before *Palladius*, the Church was rul'd and guided without any Diocesan Bishops. For, as *Fordun* hath it (o) before the coming of *Palladius* the Scots, following the Custom of the primitive Church, had Teachers of the Faith and Dispensers of the Sacraments, who were only Presbyters or Monks. And *Johannes Major* (p) saith, the Scots were instructed in the Faith by Priests and Monks without Bishops. And He-

(k) *Ad Scotos in Christum credentes ordinatur à Papa Cælestino, Palladius & primus Episcopus mittitur.* (l) Edit. Lohan. Fol. 15. (m) Ann. 429. numb. IV. *Primum verò eam gentem à Cælestino Papa Episcopum habuisse Palladium omnes consentiunt.* (n) Ibid. *Ex his autem habes quibus redarguas asserentes Sedulium Christianum Poëtam quem tantopere Gelasius laudat habuisse præceptorem Hildebertum Scotorum Archi-episcopum: Etenim cum ipse Sedulius ad Theodosii Imperatoris temporæ referatur quo modo usus esse potuit Hildeberto Scotorum Archi-episcopo præceptore, si nullus adhuc ordinatus erat in Scotia Archi-episcopus & Palladius absque controversia primus dicatur ejus Genitis Aristes.* (o) Lib. 3. Chap. 8. *Ante cujus (Palladii sc.) adventum habebant Scoti Fidei Doctores, ac Sacramentorum Ministratores, Presbyteros solummodo vel Monachos, ritum sequentes Ecclesiæ primitivæ.* (p) De gestis Scotorum. Lib. 2. *Per Sacerdotes & Monachos, sine Episcopis Scoti in fide erudiebantur.*

34 *The Fundamentals of the Hierarchy* Part I.  
*Et* Boetius (q), Palladius was the first of all who exercis'd any Hierarchical Power among the Scots, being ordain'd their Bishop by the Pope, whereas before, their Priests were, by the suffrages of the People, chosen out of the Monks and Culdees. Add hereto the known Testimony of Buchanan; and let Sir Thomas Craig, To pass over (saith he (r)) that most silly Fable of the three Archflamins, and the twenty eight Flamins; it's plain that there was no Bishop in Britain before Palladius, who is by the English themselves call'd the Bishop of the Scots; or if either the Britons or English have any, let them name them, and at what time they flourish'd.

§. 3. Yea so clear is this Truth, that the most learn'd of our Adversaries have found no better way to elude, when they cannot elide it, than, as Tornellus in another case said of Bellarmine, to endeavour the penetrating of a most firm wall, and cast the History about fourty of our ancient Scottish Kings, as a forg'd legend. Among these is Loyd Bishop of St. Asaph: but both he and Dr. Stillingfleet are nervously refuted by the learn'd Sir George Mackenzie Advocat; and that their main purpose and undertaking was utterly desperat, he makes soon appear. And tho' (saith he) this Author could prove, that we were not settl'd here, before the year 503 yet that could not answer the Argument. (viz. that is brought against Episcopacy from the Scottish primitive Church-government: for the Culdees might have been settl'd before that time. And thus, in a few syllables, he demonstrats that the Bishop, as to his ultimat design, had only his labour for his cost. But Sir George being too sagacious not to foresee that, from the mutual strugglings between himself and the Bishop, any man might easily conclude, that Presbytry was the primitive Government of the Church of Scotland: and having been one of the prime Instruments to put in execution the prelatial Fury, judg'd himself concern'd, in credit, to say somewhat in favours of Episcopacy, and attempt the stopping of such an Inference. Wherefore, to this purpose, in a Letter to the Earl of Perth, prefix'd to the defence of the Antiquity of the Royal Line of Scotland, He makes several assayes: The first whereof is,

That this is one of the meanest Arguments, that ever were us'd by a Presbyterian: ——— And that it is a weak Argument, (saith he) appears from this, that I have met with very few Laicks in all our Countrey, who had heard of it; nor with one, even of these few who had valu'd it. But be it so that

(q) Fol. 132. *Erat Palladius primus omnium qui apud Scotos sacrum egeret Magistratum, à summo Pontifice Episcopus creatus: quum antea Populi suffragiis &c.* (r) Scotland's sovereignty asserted. Page 134.

the

the Argument seem mean, we gain notwithstanding a most sufficient *Argumentum ad hominem*, seeing our ablest Adversaries value it so much; yea, Sir George himself clearly acknowledges this, while he saith, and what can the Presbyterians think of their other Arguments, which they value much? since this, which they valu'd so little, is thought of such force by a learn'd Bishop, as to deserve a whole book, the cutting off of 44 Kings, and the offending a Nation of Friends. But it's nothing tho' the Laicks had neither valu'd nor heard it, seeing, as himself grants, *Blondel*, with whom join the rest of the Presbyterian Writers, urg'd it. Hence appears, that this Argument is, by both Parties, judg'd to be of great force and consequence: for the solution whereof, the Advocat brings nothing save what is altogether unworthy of any ingenious man. As for example, since (saith he) it cannot be dem'd, but that these who ordain'd our Presbyters were Bishops; it necessarily follows, that Episcopacy was settl'd in the Christian Church before we had Presbyters or Culdees. Wherein, as to the solution of our Argument, which was the scope of his Letter, he only begs the Question, and gives us what is impertinent thereto, and contradicts, moreover, these our Historians, whose credit he so excellently vindicates, seeing, as we heard, they plainly tell us, that our ancient Antidocesan practice was the very custom of the primitive Church. And, when our Historians say that the Abbots of Icolm-kill had jurisdiction over all the Bishops of the Province, that is to be understood, as *Beda* observes, more inusitato; after an unusual manner. And yet he compares this practice of the Abbot to that of a King who makes one a Bishop, and to the practice of a Mother who makes her Son a Church-man: now if it be any strange or surprising thing for a King, by his *Congé d'eslire*, to make one a Bishop, or for a Mother to educate her Son in order to be a Church-man, and procure some place for him, let any man judge. And, later Historians (saith the Advocat) meeting with these ambiguous words in our Annals *Designatus, Electus, Ordinatus*, were, by a mistake, induc'd to appropriate these words to the formal Ceremony of Ordination and Imposition of hands. As if any man in his wit could take these words to mean any other thing than Ordination, providing they be, as they are in our Annals, spoken of one Church-man in relation to another. Moreover, he knew sufficiently that the best Records of our Country expressly say, that our Church was rul'd by Presbyters without Bishops, and so leave not the least room for tergiversation. *Beda* is one of these Authors who creat them so



much vexation; for speaking of *Icolm-kill*, the *Ile* (saith he (f)) still uses to have for us *Rektor* an *Abbot*, who is a *Presbyter* to whose Jurisdiction the whole Province and even the *Bishops* themselves, after an unusual manner ought to be subject according to the example of their first Teacher, who was no *Bishop* but a *Presbyter*. Hence it's clear, that even in *Bede's* time, *Bishops* were but of small note here, and their power much less than in other Churches. They are therefore much pain'd with *Bede's* words, and chiefly *St. Asaph*, who, amongst other odd things he excogitats, tells us, that the Superiority this *Presbyter* had over the *Bishops*, was only in respect of the Royalty of the *Ile* which the King gave the *Abbot*. As if ever *Bede*, or any man else could have mark'd such a Superiority as strange and unusual, it being nothing but what every Prince or Lord of any place still practises; who, altho' he subject himself to a *Bishop* in *Spirituals*, yet in respect of *Temporals* and the *Royalty*, uses to retain the Superiority. But, which utterly spoils the *Bishop's* comment, *Bede* (t) tells that all *Columbanus* got, was the possession of a little *Ile*, able to sustain about five Families, for building of a *Monastery*, without the least mention of his being invested with the *Royalty* thereof, or any other *Island*: and yet to him were all the *Bishops* of the whole Province (all the *Bishops* of *Scotland*, saith the *Saxon Chronicle*, cited by the *Bishop* himself) subjected, so that this pretended *Royalty* of *Columban* over the *Island*, becomes a vain dream, & tho' 'twere real could do him no kindness, the whole Province being certainly a far other thing than any such *Island*; wherefore the Superiority this *Presbyter* had over these *Bishops*, must needs have been in *Ecclesiastick* affairs; and this was really remarkable and unusual. But of this enough; for, whosoever believes that the errand of this most ancient Preacher and Propagator of *Christ's* Kingdom, was to win an earthly Kingdom to himself, and that the King shar'd with him his Sovereignty and Realm, may as soon swallow the whole legend of *Constantine's* Donation to *Sylvester*.

But to return to the *Advocat*, as, in the things that he touches, he wholly prevaricats, so he never handles our main Argument, which is taken from what is related of our Churches practice, preceeding the

(f) Lib. 3. Cap. 4. *Habere autem solet ipsa Insula Rectorem semper Abbatem Presbyterum, cujus Juri & omnis Provincia & ipsi etiam Episcopi ordine inusitato debeant esse subiecti, juxta exemplum primi Doctoris illius qui non Episcopus, sed Presbyter extitit.* (t) Ibid. Unde & præfatam Insulam ab eis in poss. ssm. in Monasterii faciendū accepit. Neque enim magna est, sed quasi Familiarum quinque &c.

coming



Sect. 7. *examin'd and disprov'd.* 37  
 coming of *Palladius*. He only refers to *Spotswood* who says (u) *Buchanan* is of opinion, that before *Palladius* his coming there was no Bishop in this Church; ----- what warrant he had to write so, I know not, except he did build upon that which *Joannes Major* saith, speaking of the same *Palladius*, ----- The Scots (he says) were instructed in the Christian Faith by Priests and Monks, without any Bishops. But from the instruction of the Scots in the Faith to conclude, that the Church after it was gathered had no other form of Government, will not stand with any reason. For be it as they speak, that by the Travels of some pious Monks the Scots were first converted unto Christ; it cannot be said that the Church was ruled by Monks, seeing long after these times it was not permitted to Monks to meddle with matters of the Church, nor were they reckon'd among the Clergy. But it's strange how he can alledge *Buchanan* to be supported by no Authors, except *Major*, for *Palladius* his being Scotland's first Bishop: he could not but know, that not only *Major*, but also *Fordun*, *Bede*, with many others within the Isle; *Prosper*, *Berymensis*, and, among the later Historians, the *Magdeburgenses*, *Baron*, with many other Transmarines, assert it. And this last affirms that none can deny it.

§. 4. It's true, *Spotswood* says (x) that *Boeth* out of ancient Annals reports that these Priests were wont for their better Government to elect some one of their number, by common suffrage, to be Chief and Principal among them, without whose knowledge and consent nothing was done in any matter of importance; and that the person so elected was called *Scotorum Episcopus*, a Scots Bishop, or a Bishop of Scotland. But they reap little advantage here, for in *Boeth's* words (y) there is no mention, as the Bishop without book affirms, whether these Annals were ancient or modern. But whatever they be *Heitor* gives ground to believe that he had Annals declaring the contrary, as appears by his words above cited, where he homologated that common sentiment of Christians, and told us that *Palladius* was our first Bishop, and that none before him had any Hierarchical Power in Scotland. To alledge therefore *Boethius* as espousing their cause here, is onely to set him at variance with all Christians, and by the ears with himself. But grant it were as *Spotswood* says, yet there should no small damage accreu to their Cause, seeing, on supposition hereof, it follows, that the Episcopal Ordination was altogether wanting in the primitive Church of Scotland; it not being supposeable that this one man could

(u) Hist. Pag. 7. (x) Hist. Page 4.

Ordain all the Pastors in *Scotland*, yea, that even this their great Bishop had no other Ordination himself, but what he receiv'd from Presbyters.

§. 5. The Bishop's following words, *from the instruction of the Scots in the Faith &c.* are altogether void of reason. For it's granted that after the coming of *Palladius* (which is the time whereunto he must refer the gathering of the Church) she then indeed began to have another Government, and never man yet pleaded, that, because the Church of *Scotland* was not govern'd by Bishops before *Palladius*, therefore 'twas not really govern'd by them after his coming; which is the Inference the Bishop's words seem to deny. But I believe there is more in them, for they are abstruse: and judge their meaning to be, that tho' we had no Bishops before *Palladius*, yet this can be no ground to conclude that we ought to have none afterward, our Church being then rude and in her infant state. The Advocate is of the same mind, saying, that *before Palladius his time our Church was constituenda or unsettl'd.* But who can believe it? For, *first*, it's generally suppos'd that *Palladius* came to free this Church from *Pelagianism*, and not to establish Church-government.

*Secondly*, Is't credible that the Church of *Scotland*, after so long a continuation and flourishing of Christianity, had been, rather than any other Churches, without any certain form of Government? This is certainly a thing unparallellable, even according to our Adversaries, who tell us that every Church very soon after its beginning had its Diocesan Bishops, and so a certain form of Government.

*Thirdly*, Yea altho' many other Churches had been without all Government for such a tract of time, there is ground to believe that *Scotland* could not; they lying most of this time under the persecuting Sword, whereas we read of no persecution in our Church, even while our Kings were *Pagan*; and our King *Donald* the I, the first crown'd Head in the World that ever subject'd it self to Jesus Christ, very much encourag'd the Christians, and was seconded herein by severals of his Successors. And altho' some of 'em were vicious, and their Reigns short, or vex'd with Wars, yet such trouble never struck directly against Christianity, like the fury of the Pagans through the rest of the World: and others were both excellent Men, and had longer and peaceable Reigns, as *Findochus*, and *Cratdinthus*, but especially *Fincormachus*, an excellent man and a great promoter of Religion, and therefore, as is most presumable, was a great Instrument under God, for the settlement of our Church-affairs.

Add

Add to all this, *Fourthly*, That the terrible Storm of Persecution through the *Roman* World, drove then from the Brittons, and other places, no small number of excellent Men to *Scotland*, who doubtless did no small service to God therein, and especially in the time of *Fincormachus*, when, as all observe, a great many fled hither who were famous both for Life and Doctrine, yea long before this even in the time of *Tertullian*, our Church was well known to much of the Christian World, as appears from his clear Testimony. *The places of Britain* (saith he (y) ) *to which the Romans could not yet pass, are notwithstanding subject to Christ.* And if any have called *Scotland* barbarous, or not well reform'd before the coming of *Palladius*, Sir *George* learn'dly refutes them; and names severals, and among them even *Stannihurst*, otherways an enemy to our Nation, who have done it: and he well observes, *that the reason why some speak of us as then not well enough reform'd, was because of our want of agreement with the Church of Rome.*

§. 6. As to the last part of the Bishop's discourse, saying, *that it was not permitted to Monks to meddle with the matters of the Church &c.* And wherein he is seconded by *St. Asaph*, who falls foul on Presbyterians on this account, as if they were darkners of all Church History &c. They should know, that as our Historians call'd these *Monks*, they also call'd them *Priests*, sometimes *Presbyters*, or *Bishops*, or *Doctors*, and frequently *Culdees*. Our people (saith *Boeth* (z) ) also began most seriously at that time to embrace the Doctrine of Christ, by the guidance, and exhortation of some Monks; who, because they were most diligent in Preaching, and frequent in Prayer, were call'd by the Inhabitants, Worshippers of God: which name took such deep root with the common People, that all the Priests, even to our time, were commonly without difference call'd *Culdees*, i. e. Worshippers of God: Elsewhere this Author call'd these Teachers and Guides indifferently *Priests*, *Monks*, and *Culdees*. Thus also speaks the best of our Historians, some of whom we have heard calling them *Presbyters*, and *Administrators of the Sacraments*. Hence 'tis clear, that when they call them *Monks*, the word is not to be taken in the later Popish sense, for a *Lay-*

(y) Contra Judæos. Cap. 7. Loca Britanniarum Romanis inaccessa, Christo tamen subdita. (z) Lib. 6. Fol. 95. v. 40. Cuperi & nostri eo tempore Christi dogma accuratissime amplectari Monachorum quorundam duellu & adhortatione qui quia sedulo prædicationi vacarent, essentque frequentes in oratione, ab incolis Cultores Dei sunt appellati: invaluit id nomen apud vulgus in tantum ut Sacerdotes omnes ad nostra pene tempora vulgo Culdæ; i. e. Cultores Dei, sine discrimine vocarentur.

*hermits*; for these our primitive Pastors were only call'd Monks, by reason of their strictness of life, and frequent retirement to Devotion, when the publick work of the Ministry did permit it, and perhaps also divers of them abstain'd from Marriage, that they might keep themselves free from the World, and its care, without urging this on others, as was the practice of the famous *Paphnutius* in the council of Nice: From all which I conclude, that before the coming of *Palladius*, we had a settl'd Church without the least umbrage of their Hierarchy.

§. 7. I add, that long after that, it had but very slender footing here; seeing, according to *Spotswood*, they had no distinct Titles or Dioceses, whose words (a) are, *neither had our Bishops any other Title (then that of Scotorum Episcopi, or Scottish Bishops) whereby they were distinguish'd, before the days of Malcomb the III, who first divided the Country into 'Dioceses, appointing to every Bishop the limus &c.* Yea, after most strict search, (b) for a long time posterior to *Palladius*, he can scarce find the least footsteps of Episcopacy. And again, long it was after the distinction of Dioceses, before they were admitted to any civil Places or Votes in Parliament. Hence nothing is more certain than that, for many Ages, the Church of Scotland knew nothing of their Hierarchy: the first Rudiments whereof were brought from *Rome*, which was sent packing thither again, when we renounc'd our obedience to Anti-christ.

§. 8. Take but one other particular, and I take leave of the Advocat: he's much displeas'd with *St. Asaph* terming him a Carester of Fanaticks, for affirming that in consequence of this our Argument taken from the confess'd Practice of our primitive Church, we might reasonably conclude, that when we covenanted against Episcopacy, we had only us'd our own right; and thrown out that which was a confess'd Innovation; in order to the restoring of that, which was our primitive Government. A notable and never to be forgotten Concession of so learn'd an Adversary as is this Bishop. Let's hear what the Advocat returns him. *It will not follow (saith he) that because our Church in its infancy and necessity was without Bishops for some years; therefore it was reasonable for Subjects, to enter into a solemn League and Covenant, without, and against the Consent of their Monarch; and to extirpat Episcopacy settl'd then by Law, and by an Old Prescription of 1200 years at least.* But this most unfair Representation of our Arguments antecedent is, I trust, now sufficiently discover'd: wherefore, I have no.

thing to do here with it, nor yet am oblig'd to evince the consequence he denies, seeing 'tis not to be accounted ours but his own, who made the antecedent. Of the Grounds why the Nation entered into a Covenant, I also discours'd already. In the mean while, I can't but take notice of his *settling Episcopacy by Prescription*; a Romish Argument, which, whatever it may do in Law, has no place here. His *Prescription*, I'm sure, essentially differs from that of *Tertullian* against the Heresies of his time, seeing he liv'd in a very early Age, when especially, if ever, *Prescription* could have place in the Church, and the Doctrines which he defended were generally and uninterruptedly held by the Pastors, even from the Apostles times, and more ancient than the Heresies, against which he prescribes, whereas in the present case all things are clean contrary. For, as the Advocat himself here supposes, the original of *Scottish Episcopacy* is several Ages posterior to that of the Apostles; so that if the Argument could militate for either Party, it serv'd well the Church of Scotland against Prelacy, and not at all *e contra*. But tho' things had been quite otherwise, there had been no fear of harm from their Prescriptions; seeing, as *Vincentius Lerinensis* admonishes (c) *In refutation of inveterat Errors, we must recur to the sole authority of the Scriptures*. And *Optatus Milevit*, plainly asserts that *Christ's Testament abundantly suffices to determine all, and every particular Controversie among Christians*. Thus we see how pleasant a spectacle these two Champions afford us; the Bishop forms the *Major Proposition*, and asserts, on supposition of the Antiquity of our Royal Line, and veracity of our Historians, that our Church acted with reason enough, and was only recovering her own Right, when she cashier'd Prelacy. The Advocat, in attempting to disprove this the Bishop's Proposition, has only giv'n such prevarications and elusions, as most strongly confirm all the dis-interested of the truth thereof. As for the *Minor Proposition*, that our ancient Royal Line is not forg'd but real, and our historical Monuments most true and credible, the Advocat himself, to the conviction of all the unbiass'd, in both his Books, makes appear. It remains therefore as a conclusion of undoubted verity that our Church was acting most rationally, and only recovering her own Right, when at any time she expell'd Prelacy, together with all its Innovations.

(c) Cap. 39. *Ceterum dilatare & inveterata Hæreses nequaquam licet.*

§. 9. There is yet another Advocate of the Party, whose look is more stout than his Fellows. We shall try if his reason be answerable to his confidence. I mean *A. M. D. D.* (I shall design him *D. M.*) The Author of a late Book call'd, *An Enquiry into the New Opinions (chiefly) propagated by the Presbyterians in Scotland.* Who, (*d*) in opposition to the *Defender of the Vindication of the Church Scotland*, handles the same Argument at large, and supposes, as a main Ground of his Discourse, that his Antagonist denies, that there is any force in *Argumento negativo.* To require (*saith D. M.*) that a matter of Fact be attested by competent Witnesses is, in the language of our Author to raze the Foundation of all History. He spends therefore about 14 pages, to prove that a negative Argument in some Cases may have place. But vainly, seeing the Author of the Vindication does not once insinuate (*e*) that a negative Argument can in no Cases be us'd, or that to require competent Witnesses in a matter of Fact, is to raze the Foundation of all History. Yea he believ'd that there were Witnesses so competent for his Assertion, that no Argument, whither negative, or of whatsoever kind else, shall ever be able to darken their Testimony, and that we have as good ground for our ancient Church, her being without Bishops, as for any other part of our Nations Antiquities. And indeed the Argument the Apologist, whom *D. M.* would vindicate, us'd, levels at all parts of our ancient History, no less then at the thing under debate. The Argument was, *There were none that lived near that age that wrote the History of it, and the Monks who wrote any thing were extremely ignorant.* Now this, if it do any thing to the Author's purpose, equally shakes and overthrows all parts of our ancient History, seeing with the like force and success it may be brought against any of'em. Justly therefore repones the Defender of the Vindication, that this is at one blow to raze the Foundation of the History of our Nation, and that of most others: and to make them all to be Fools, who have enquired into these Antiquities that concern our Nation, and others: such as Fordon, Major, Beda, Usher &c. whereto, all, *D. M.* rejoins, is, that many collateral proofs may be brought from the Roman Historians, that the Scots inhabited that part of Britain, long before the imaginary period of his Presbyterian Church. ----- And the manner of reckoning the Scottish Genealogies at their Marriages, their Births, and other remarkable Solemnities,

(*d*) Page 227. Et sequentibus. (*e*) Defence of the Vindication of the Church of Scotland. Page 36.

was



was an infallible conveyance of true, constant and perpetual Traditions. Their Bards whose Science it was to repeat those Genealogies upon solemn Occasions, & to celebrate their greatest Achievements in verse, could not add one to the number of their Kings, but upon the Death of his Predecessor. But in all his Discourse, there is wrapt up a concession of all the Defender of the Vindication charg'd on the Apologist; seeing he evidently intimates, that unless it be assertin'd some other way, nothing in any of our Countries Historians merits any credit. And to confirm this, I except, (saith he) against all the three, (viz. Fordon, Major and Boethius) that none of'em, could be a competent Witness in Affairs of that nature at so great a distance from their own time, unless they had nam'd the Authors and Records upon whose Testimony their Relation was founded. As to his mentioning of collateral Proofs &c. it is a meer Sham; seeing, if once we yeeld with him, that no credit is due to any of our Monuments now extant, except what is confirm'd by some exotick Records, how sorry an account have we of any of our Antiquities of whatsoever kind? which forraign Testimonies notwithstanding may, if compar'd with our Writers, give light to our Histories.

I'm sure moreover, notwithstanding of whatsoever old Traditions, or Bard's verses are mention'd, all or surely most of these now being lost, or, tho' extant, mostly unintelligible, our Royal Line could never be asserted without ascribing to our Writers, both the reach and integrity of able and faithfull Historians. And yet D. M. is not afraid to compare his Apologist negative Argument to another of Eusebius lib. 3. Where (saith D. M.) by this very Argument, he overthrowes the authority of several Books that some would impose upon the Church, meerly because they were not duely attested, and none of the Ancients brought any Testimonies from them. But Eusebius saw and perus'd these Ancients, who either directly or occasionally mention'd all the Canonical Books, and so justly their silence overthrowed the Authority of the Spurious, and bask'd the credit of their Imposers: but has D. M. or his Apologist, seen or perus'd all the Monuments from which our Historians took their materials, and which were lost long before either of them were born? Can they from these Records, tho' they would fain do't, rub shame upon all the Historians of our Countrey, as a crew of lying Forgers? seeing then, that this is impossible to be done, and that, as the Advocat has solidly made out, they were men of sufficient Candor and Reputation; seeing they us'd many ancient Records now lost, and were of sufficient Discretion and



Knowledge to distinguish genuine from fictitious, seeing they relate what we plead for with no less unanimity and concord than they do any thing else, and either profess, or sufficiently enough intimat, that they brought all their Composours from ancient Records, seeing that their Judgement is confirm'd by unsuspected Forerunners both ancient and modern, yea and suffrages of all mankind, who had ever any occasion to speak of this matter, seeing what they relate is so far from being fabulous, that our ancient Church-government they mention is sufficiently attested and acknowledg'd by the fiercest of our Adversaries to be truly Apostolick, and seeing, lastly, as we have heard, Prelacy, for a long time after *Palladius*, was of far less bulk and power in *Scotland*, than in other Churches; the *Apologists* negative Argument has just as much consanguinity with that of *Eusebius*, as is between a down-right Paralogism, and a solid Deduction: yea I averr moreover, that considering Prelacy was then at its *Ela* in *Scotland*, and none of our Historians at least before *Buchanan* were Presbyterian, nor could reap any Advantage by disoblighing the Prelats, any one of their Testimonies alone might give sufficient ground to believe that what they said was well founded on good and ancient Records.

§. 10. But after a long, and, as himself truly says, needless digression, he comes to examine our Testimonies, and will have *Boethius* to contradict the rest, alledging that his meaning is not, that *Palladius* was the first Bishop, but only the first sent from *Rome*, but of *Boethius* already.

Here *D. M.* falls foul on *Blondel* as a corrupter of *Boethius*, because he said as out of him that the Presbyters elected and ordain'd their Bishop. There is nothing (saith *D. M.*) said by *Boethius*, but that the Bishops were elected from among both the Priests and Monks. And true it is there is no more said in the words *D. M.* cites, but 'tis as true that elsewhere (f) *Boethius* expressly says, that the Pastors, Priests or Culdees themselves by common suffrage elected this Pontificem or Presett. Add hereto, that, if *Boethius* have said ought inadvertently or obscurely, he is to be correct'd or explain'd by the harmonious and most express Testimonies of *Fordun*, *Major*, *Buchanan*, *Craig*, and other such most learn'd of our Antiquaries, all of whom are, beyond scruple, most positive for what we affirm.

§. 11. Next he assaults *Prosper's* Testimony, alledging that, according to *Baron*, *Palladius* was not sent to the Scots in *Britain*, *Baronius*

(f) Fol. 95. Pontificem inter se communi suffragio deligebant &c.

(saith

(saith D. M.) *never thought that Palladius was sent by Pope Cœlestine to the Scoto-Britanni, but rather to the Irish. And, whatever the Testimony of Prosper be, Spondanus and Baronius leave the Vindicator, for they understood Prosper's words of Palladius his mission to Ireland, and not to that part of Britain, which is now call'd Scotland. To prove this his Assertion he adduces, but, which was his wisdom, untranslated, these words of Baron (g); that he (viz. Palladius) was brought also into the Isle of Ireland, but was soon taken away by Death, is related by Probus, who wrote the Deeds of St. Patrick. Egregiously reason'd! Probus saith that Palladius went once into Ireland; therefore Baron thought the words of Prosper not at all to be understood of his coming into Scotland. Surely this Author may be allow'd a chief place in their next Book of Sports for the Sabbath. Yea these words, that he was brought also &c. seem clearly to hold forth that he was sent to another place beside, out of which he came into Ireland, and what place this was, the immediatly preceeding words evince (b); the same year and in the time of the same Consuls St. Prosper saith that Palladius was sent to the Scots, being ordain'd the first Bishop. That he (continues Cardinal Baron) was brought also into the Isle of Ireland &c. Where 'tis most evident that Baron distinguishes the Scots, to whom Prosper saith Palladius was sent, from the Inhabitants of Ireland. But, to cut off all further debate of this matter, the Cardinal clearly demonstrates what we plead for, while he expressly says, (i) that they highly honour Palladius his Relicks which are bury'd in the Mernes, a Province of Scotland. And the Cardinal continuing his Discourse of the same Scots, whose first Bishop, in his Judgement Prosper makes Palladius to have been (k), saith that their late Queen (viz. Mary) was the Glory of the Catholic Faith, and a Martyr: but I insist not on a matter so evident, the Advocat hath learn'dly made it out, and prevented all such attempts of D. M. and the like Enemies of our Countrey.*

(g) Ann. 431. Numb. 191. *Perduſtum quoque fuiſſe ad Hiberniam Inſulam, ſed citò morte ſubduſtum ex hac vita migraviſſe, ex Probo qui res geſtas S. Patricii ſcripſiſſe diſtum eſt ſuperius, Hibernorum quidem converſionem Deus S. Patricio reſervaviſſe. (b) Ibid. Hæc eodem annò ſub iſdem Conſulibus Sanctus Proſper miſſum ait Palladium ordinatum primum Epiſcopum ad Scotos: perduſtum quoque fuiſſe ad Hiberniam &c. (i) Numb. 4. ----- Magno honore proſequentes ejus Reliquias in Mernia Scotiæ Provincia collocatas. (k) Numb. 5. Porro eandem Eccleſiam nobiliſſimam hoc noſtro ſaculo Deus tentari permiſiſſe, ut Chriſtiana conſtantia præclariſſimum ſpecimen ederet, cum inter alios Martyres habere etiam meruit (quod nulla hætenus Chriſtiana Gens habuit) ipſam Reginam, Catholica Fidei eximium Decus & ornamentum diſtiſſimâ conſeſſione in carcere ante probatam, nobiliori coronâ Martyrii auſtam.*

§. 12. He having thus abus'd *Baron*, prepares next for the depravation of *Prosper* himself, telling us, *that all that can be infer'd is, that Palladius was the first Bishop of the Roman mission.* But *Prosper's* words are clear and without any such limitation. *Palladius* (saith he) is ordain'd by *Pope Cœlestine* for the Scots that had already believed in *Christ*, and is sent to them to be their first Bishop. Behold our very Assertion, and why we should yeeld it, and in lieu thereof imbrace its contrary, I am yet to learn. He adds, *that as soon as the Pope aspired to his unlimited and universal Supremacy, there were several Bishops sent to other Churches, already constituted, not to introduce Episcopacy, which was the Government of the universal Church, but rather a subjection to, and uniformity with the Roman See.* But tho' all this were as true as some of it is false, it's nothing to the purpose, except he find good Authors, wherein a Bishop sent to a People, who not only were Christians, but also govern'd by Bishops before he came, is called without restriction their first Bishop.

And *Boethius* (continues *D. M.*) understood the History of *Palladius* in this sense, Which tho' 'twere yeelded, stands him in little stead, seeing all the Historians & Antiquaries of our Countrey, and, as we have heard from *Card. Baron*, with whom joins our learn'd Advocat, all men every-where else understand *Prosper* in the sense we plead for; believing that there was no Bishop in Scotland before *Palladius*.

But 'twill not satisfie *D. M.* to wrest *Prosper's* words, except he also at once overthrow his whole Chronicle, telling us, *that it is not thought by the learned to be the genuine Work of Prosper.* All he brings for this, is a conjecture of *Petrus Pithæus*, fancying that the Chronicle ascrib'd to *Prosper*, & appended to that of *Eusebius* & *Hierome*, is of a different stile from that of a confus'd fragment, which he took for a part of the true *Prosper's* Chronicle, & wherein there is nothing concerning *Palladius*. But why the meer conjecture of one man should be enough to discredit that Chronicle so universally ascrib'd to *Prosper*, I leave to the Judgment of the learned. *Vossius* (1) indeed mentions this fragment, but if it be preferable to the vulgar Copy, determines not: neither, for ought I know, did ever any save, *D. M.* embrace this faint Conjecture of *Pithæus*, and indeed there must be brought incomparably better Arguments before that confus'd fragment either be prefer'd to, or vye with the universally receiv'd Copy, immemorially, under *Prosper's* name, affixed to *Hierome's*

Chronicle. Moreover, seeing this Schred is most disordered, and the words now under debate most universally believ'd to have been written by *Prosper*, 'tis highly probable, on supposition that this fragment is a part of the true consular Chronicle, that it once contain'd that passage, tho' throw mutilation, and either negligent or malicious transcribing, it hath now lost it: however the matter be, we are at no loss; for never was there a sentence more unanimously ascrib'd to any Author than this concerning *Palladius* is to *Prosper*, and is by all, both ancient and modern acknowledg'd (m): so that all their endeavours to prove this passage supposititious, and that it belongs not to *Prosper*, or some else of equal Antiquity, and Authority, are the last efforts of meer desperation,

And indeed had they not in defiance of the whole Christian World and Truth it self, resolv'd *per fas aut nefas* to maintain that there was never a Church without Diocesan Bishops before the time of *Calvine* and *Beza*, they had never adventur'd their skulls on what is so hard, firmly bottom'd, and so universally believed. Have we not already heard fully, how the most knowing and zealous for Prelacy while they sustain'd the truth of our Countrey Histories, and yet labour'd to disprove what we now plead for, gave only, in favours of their latter Assertion, trifles so empty, and prevarications so apparent, that 'tis most presumable they believ'd nothing of what they said, & how the most learn'd of the Episcopal Perswasion acknowledg'd the truth of our Assertion, on supposition that any credit is to be given to our Historians, with whom also joins the learn'd Dr *Stillingfleet* (n), So (saith he) *if we may believe the great Antiquaries of the Church of Scotland, that Church was governed by their Cul-dei as they called their Presbyters without any Bishop over them for a long time.* He gives also instances of other ancient Churches without Diocesan Bishops.

§. 13. It had been more manly therefore and honest for D. *M.* to have at least attempted a refutation of Dr. *Stillingfleet*, than to have dar'd his Adversaries to bring but one example of Churches without Diocesan Bishops, seeing he knew there were store already giv'n even by Episcopals, no less than Presbyterians, which hitherto stand unanswered. Let them also chaw their cude on that famous and well known Distinction of a first and second primitive Church acknowledged by *Semeca* and others,

(m) *Vide Usserii Brit. Eccles. Antiquates.* Page 799. (n) *Irenicum*  
Part 2. Ch. 7.

even

even Popish Divines, notic'd by *Usher* (o) and embrac'd by *Stillingfleet* (p), in the former whereof Diocesan Episcopacy was not yet come in fashion, nor was any such thing as a Difference, either in Name or Office, between Bishops, and Priests or preaching Presbyters, then in Being. From all which judge with what brow D. *M.* compares the account of our ancient Church-government to a supposed Fiction of the *King of China*, and his *Presbyterian Lady*.

And by this dealing of D. *M.* I am put in mind of another piece of his Art, who (q) averres that all brought by *Salmasius* and *Blondel* to prove that *Hierome* was for the Scriptural and Apostolick Identity of of *Bishop & Presbyter*, and whatsoever is said by them, for Presbytry is refuted by D. *Pearson* in his *Vindicia Ignatiana*. I must not (saith D. *M.*) transcribe the accurat and unanswerable *Dissertations* of several learned Men, who have sufficiently exposed the *Writings* of *Blondel* and *Salmasius* on this head, particularly the incomparable *Bishop of Chester* (vind St. Ignat.) But no where did ever Dr. *Pearson* ingage with these Authors on this subject, nor does he any such thing, only he has some few excursions which touch not the marrow of the Controversie, and therefore is nothing to D. *M.*'s purpose, whether the advantage be yeilded to *Salmasius* and *Blondel* or to Dr. *Pearson*. He abuses also some passages of *Hierome* to prove him self-repugnant, but all such depravations had been by *Junius* and others against the Papists, and by *Stillingfleet* in his *Irenicum* clearly discover'd, & the places unanswerably vindicated, even before he wrote his *Vindicia*, which their vindications of *Hierome*, as also many other defences of the same Author brought by *Salmasius* and *Blondel*, he scarce once adventures to handle. But he has vindicated *Ignatius*, they will say, and this is enough. But suppose that he had as really evinced these Epistles to be the genuine Work of *Ignatius*, as he's groundlessly pretended to have don't, yet so far is their inference from being good, that as we shall hear, the quite contrary follows, viz. that in the *Ignatian* age, Bishops were all one with the Pastors of single Congregations. Hence it appears that this was one of D. *M.*'s pious Frauds to skarr his vulgar Reader (for others he could not hope to catch thereby) from the *New Doctrine of Presbytry*.

(o) Antiq. Brit. Eccles. Page 809. (p) Iren, Part 2. Ch. 6. (q) Page 39, & 40.

Section

## Section VIII.

*Prelacy opposite to the Principles of our Reformers.*

I Said, when we renounc'd our Obedience to Anti-christ, we sent, amongst the rest of the Romish leaven, Prelacy packing thither: which, tho' we had no more Arguments, our Confession of Faith compil'd by our Reformers clearly evinces. *We detest (say they) Anti-christ's worldly Monarchy with his wicked Hierarchy.* Of which Hierarchy, as is acknowledg'd by the Council of Trent (a), & Bellarmine (b), the Bishops make a principal part. *And the Episcopal Office with its distinction, belong solely to their Hierarchy, otherwise, they confess, there's no Difference between Bishop and Presbyter.* At them therefore these words of the Confession must especially level. And his subtilty, who would save the Prelats from this blow, by seeking the foundation of a distinction where 'tis not; as if by the word *Wicked*, the Confession pointed at another Hierarchy which is *Pious*, must be reckon'd, by all the disinterested, to nigh of kin to his *pericranium*, who, to save another part of Romanism, made a fair distinction between *Lawfull and Unlawfull Idolatry*. I say, it can be no otherwise here; for, to speak truth, their Hierarchy is nothing, save the Corruption of Church-government, and pride of her Governours, rais'd by certain stories, and tending towards the Papacy, as its highest pinnacle, whereof both name and notion owe their Original to one, who indeed was not the Father of lies, yet in lying came so near him, as readily any copy to its Original. I mean the false *Arcopagite*, whose whole Book may really be term'd a fardel of Fictions. Moreover, this Confession was compil'd in the year 1581. when Prelacy had been unanimously by the whole Assembly, in the preceeding year cast out of the Church. And for many succeeding Assemblies, their Declaration of their dislike and hatred of Prelacy, and approbation of this Confession, went hand in hand, with whom then in

(a) De Sacramento ordinis. Can. 6. (b) De Clericis. Cap. 11.



both of these, the King's Majesty join'd. For the Assembly at Glasgow 1581. consisting for the most part, of such as voted, and were present in the Assembly at Dundie, in the preceeding year when Prelacy had in terminus been renounc'd and ejected, declares that they meant wholly to condemn the whole estate of Bishops, as they are now in Scotland,-----and that this was the meaning of the Assembly at that time. The King's Commissioner presented to this Assembly the Confession of Faith, subscribed by the King, and his household, not long before, together with a plot of the Presbyteries to be erected, which is registrat in the Books of the Assembly, with a Letter to be directed from his Majesty to the Noble-men, and Gentle-men of the Country, for the erection of the Presbyteries, consisting of Pastors, and Elders, and dissolution of Prelacies, and with an offer to set forward the Policy untill 'twere establish'd by Parliament. The King's Letter subscribed by his hand, to the Noble-men, and Gentle-men, was read in open audience of the whole Assembly. This Assembly ordain'd also that the Confession of Faith be subscribed, as being true, Christian, and faithfull. And in the Assembly 1595. amongst other things of the same tendency, it was cleared that Episcopacy was condemn'd in these words of the Confession **His Wicked Hierarchy**. See store of irrefragable proofs of this our Assertion in the Acts of the Assembly at Glasgow, 1638. Sess. 16.

§. 2. They only bewray their ignorance, if not worse, while they give out, that our Church, in her first Reformation, had Bishops (as the word is now taken) under the name of Superintendents. For tho' this were true, all they shall gain hereby, would only be the fastening of a self-contradiction on Mr. Knox, and the rest of these most honourable Instruments of our Freedom from Mystical Babylon: our Adversaries acknowledging that Mr. Knox, and his Fellow-labourers in the Church-policy, did exactly follow the Genevan Model, which these men use to make the Original of Presbytry: It's confess'd also (c) that John Knox refus'd a Bishoprick in England on this account, that it had *Quid commune cum Antichristo*. Whereby, tho' nothing else could be brought, 'tis clear as the Sun, that Knox (I may say the same of most of his Fellow-labourers in the Reformation) was intirely averse from their Hierarchy Domination.

§. 3. Wherefore the Author of a late Book call'd *The Fundamental Charter of Presbytry examin'd and disprov'd*, quite skips over these Eviden-

(c) Fuller, lives of the Divines.



ees of *Knox's* being Antiprelatick; notwithstanding that the only design of the far greater part of his Book, was directly to prove these our Reformers, and *Knox* in special, to have been of the prelatical Perswasions. However, let's hear the chief of the Answers he gives to such other Proofs hereof, as he adventures to engage with. (d)

§. 4. The first is a passage of *Knox's* letter to the Assembly, viz. *Unfaithfull, and Traitors to the Flock, shall ye be before the Lord Jesus if that with your consent, directly or indirectly, ye suffer unworthy men to be thrust in within the Ministry of the Kirk under what pretence that ever it be. Remember the Judge before whom ye must make an account, and resist that Tyranny as ye would avoid Hell-fire.* To which our Author answers denying that *Knox* by Tyranny here means Episcopacy, and saith, *that 'tis impossible to make more of the Letter, than that Knox deem'd it a pernicious and tyrannical thing, for any Person whatsoever to thrust unworthy Men into the Ministry of the Church.* Which Answer evanishes, so soon as we shall understand the occasion of *Knox's* Letter. Some powerfull Courtiers had then sacrilegiously invaded a great part of the Churches Revenues; and were greedily grasping the remainder, to the great grief of all good Men, and detriment of the Church, which both in her Assemblies, and otherways, vehemently urged that these Revenues should be employ'd on sustentation of Ministers, many of whom, being unprovided, were ready to starve; and on maintaining of Schools, relieving the Poor, and other such pious Uses. These Courtiers therefore, to free themselves of such unacceptable Monitors, and secure them of what they had gotten, plot the reduction of a kind of *Diocesan Bishops, Abbots, Priors,* and other such Popish Orders, with whom they were to make a sacrilegious Compact, and to give these titular Church-men some small pittance of the Revenues, the rest being possessed, in their name, by these Courtiers. Now at the very time of the writing of *Knox's* Letter, this was in agitation, and a design laid to practise upon some of the Assembly, as shortly thereafter at the Meeting in *Leith* appear'd, at which, and elsewhere in these times; there were not wanting among the Ministers, who, moved with hope of Domination over their Brethren, and some small augmentation of Rent, made no bones of such simoniacal Pactions or (to use the expresse words of the Confessions of their best Friends) such *dirty and vile Bargains.* (e)

(d) Pag. 24. *Et sequentibus.* (e) *Fund. Charter.* Pag. 26. *Spotswood. Hist.* Pag. 316.

And now judge what Knox mean'd by his Exhortation to keep out unworthy Men, and resist Tyranny: And 'tis most presumable that Spotswood (e) sufficiently saw, that Knox's Letter goares Prelacy, otherwise he had not mangl'd the same, and wholly omitted all mention of Tyranny.

§. 5. And that this Knox's Letter levell'd at the Bishops then about to be introduc'd, is further evident from his refusal to inaugurate John Douglas Bishop of St. Andrews, his denouncing an Anathema to the Giver and Receiver of the Biskoprick, and his open professing his dislike of the whole Order. At this our Author takes exception, saying, *The certain Manuscript from which Calderwood says he had this relation, is uncertain.* But he should have look'd into Petrie, who (f) names the Author William Scot, that eminent Minister at Couper.

Now, that 'tis like enough that Knox, who was then at St. Andrews, said so, and express'd suitable resentments of the dirty Bargain between Morton and Douglas, who by a simoniacal Paction, got into the See, is by our Author expressly acknowledg'd. And indeed, if we consider the indignity of the Crime, and the Lyon-like boldness of Mr. Knox against such Vices, 'tis altogether incredible, but that he vented his resentments with a Witness, and to the noticing of all thinking Men then present: yet all this is skipp'd over by Spotswood. For he knew well enough, that this Relation should have shew'd how little kindness Knox bore to their Hierarchy.

Moreover, which is most noticeable in this matter, these who then favour'd Prelacy, being generally such simoniacal Pedlers, were so far from writing the several Actions and Church-transactions of these times, that they made it their care to suppress and destroy the publick Monuments of the Church. Witness B. Adamson (g): one of the Articles of whose Confession, to which, as is acknowledg'd by Spotswood (h), he subscrib'd, was, *that not without his special allowance, some leaves of the Books of the Assemblies were rent out, and such things as made against the Bishops their estate, were destroyed in Falkland, before the Books were deliver'd to the King's Majesty.* Which considerations, suffice to prove the truth of that historical Relation.

He alledges next, that tho' we had reason to believe, that Knox said and did so, yet it follows not that he was for the Divine Right of Parity. Add-

(e) Hist. Page 257, 258. (f) Century 15. Page 371. (g) Cald. Hist. Page 261. (h) Hist. Page 385.

ing,

ing, *That 'tis like enough Knox said so-----for dreadfull Invasions were made upon the Patrimony of the Church.* But this Invasion was so linked with the introduction of Prelacy, that they had both common Friends and Enemies, so that *Knox* declaring against either, must be judg'd equally averse from both. And indeed the introduction of Prelacy, was consequentially this very destruction and consumption of the Churches Goods, against which *Knox* inveigh'd. Or dare he say, that it had satisfi'd him, if they had been consum'd in sustaining the Luxury and Grandour of *Bishops*, *Abbots*, and *Priors*, whom the Court was about then to introduce, providing only these Church Revenues, had been kept from the secular Nobility. Moreover, 'tis evident, to whosoever reads *Knox's* words, that the Invasion of the Church-patrimony, was far from being the sole Ground of the dislike he shew'd to Episcopacy. The Matter in short is, when *John Douglas* was made *Tulchan Bishop* of *St. Andrews*, *Mr. Knox* refused to Ordain him, denouncing Anathemas to the Giver, and to the Receiver: and when *John Rutherford* *Provest* of the old Colledge had said, that *Mr. John Knox's* repining, had proceeded from male-contentment, the next *Lore's*-day, *John Knox* said in Sermon, *I have refus'd greater Bishoprick than ever 'twas, and might have had it with the favour of greater Men than he hath this, but I did, and do repine for discharge of my Conscience, that the Church of Scotland be not subject to that Order.* This last Clause, viz. *that the Church of Scotland be not subject to that Order,* he adventures not once to mention, which yet is a reason of *Knox's* repining, and so gives the meaning of his whole Discourse. And seeing 'tis of equal credit with his foregoing words, being not only with the rest taken by *Petrie*, out of that *Historical Relation*, but related also by *Calderwood* (i) fully scatters all his fogg, and clearly determines the present Question, somewhat else he hath here, but of small moment. As, *Knox*, when *Douglas*, who was already *Rector* of the University, and *Provest* of the old Colledge was made *Bishop*, regretted, that so many Offices were laid on an old Man, which scarcely twenty of the best Gifts were able to bear. Thence he Infers, that *Knox's* resentment of *Douglas's* advance, was not from any Perswasion, he had of the unlawfulness of Prelacy. As if *Knox* might not assert the unlawfulness of Prelacy, and yet say so much for a *Superpondium* to his other Grievances. And to shew, even on Supposition, as they pretended, of the allowableness of Episcopacy, how little

(i) Ms. Hist. Vol. 2, Page 34c.

sence of Duty or Conscience was in either Givers or Receivers.

§. 6, 'There was at this time (saith M. D. Hume. (k)), no small  
'Contest and Debate, betwixt the Court and the Church, about Bishops  
'and Prelats, concerning their Office and Jurisdiction. The Ministers  
'laboured to have them quite abolished and taken away, and the Court  
'thought that form of Government to be agreeable, and compatible with  
'a Monarchical Estate, and more conform to the Rules of Policy, and  
'Civil Government of a Kingdom. Besides, the Courtiers had tasted  
'the sweetness of their Rents and Revenues, putting in titular Bishops,  
'who were only their Receivers, and had a certain Pension or Stipend,  
'for discharging and executing the Ecclesiastical part of their Office, but  
'the main profit was taken up by Courtiers for their own use. Where-  
'fore they laboured to retain at least these shadows of Bishops, for let-  
'ting of leases, and such other things, which they thought were not  
'good in Law otherways. There was none more forward to keep them  
'up than the Earl of *Morton*; for he had gone Ambassadour to *England*  
'on his own privat Charges, and to recompence his great Expenses in  
'that Journey, the Bishoprick of *St. Andrews*, being then vacant, was  
'confer'd upon him. He put in Mr. *John Douglass* (who was Provost  
'of the New Colledge in *St. Andrews*) to bear the Name of Bishop,  
'and to gather the Rents (till such time as the Solemnity of Inaugurati-  
'on could be obtain'd) for which he was countable to him. This he  
'did immediatly after he came home out of *England*. Now he will  
'have him to sit in Parliament, and to vote there as Arch-bishop. The  
'Superintendent of *Fyfe*, did inhibit him to sit there, or to Vote under  
'pain of Excommunication; *Morton* commanded him to do it, un-  
'der pain of Treason and Rebellion. The Petition giv'n in to the Par-  
'liament, desiring a competent Provision for the maintaine of Preach-  
'ers, in which they complained of the wrong done unto them by the  
'Courtiers, who intercepted their means, was cast over the Bare, and re-  
'jected, and by the most common report, *Morton* was the first cause  
'thereof. Afterward *Morton* in a Meeting of some Delegates, and Com-  
'missioners of the Church at *Leinh*, by the Superintendent *Dunné's*  
'means, used the matter so, that he obtain'd their Consent to have his  
'Bishop admitted, and install'd. Wherefore, the third of *February*,  
'he caus'd affix a schedul on the Church door of *St. Andrews*, wherein he

(k) History of the Houses of *Douglass* and *Angus*. Page 320.

'charged

'charged the Ministers to convene, and admit him to the Place, which they did accordingly, but not without great Opposition. For Mr. Patrick Adamson (then a Preacher, but afterward Arch-bishop there himself) in a Sermon which he preached against the Order and Office of Bishops, said, there were three sorts of Bishops: 1. The Lords Bishop (to wit Christ's) and such was every Pastor. 2. My Lord Bishop, that is, such as Bishop as is a Lord, who sits, and Votes in Parliament, and exercises Jurisdiction over his Brethren. 3. And the third sort was, (my Lord's Bishop) that is, one whom some Lord or Nobleman at Court did put into the place to be his Receiver, to gather the Rents, and let Leases for his Lordship's behoofe, but had neither the Means nor Power of a Bishop. This last sort he called a *Tulchan Bishop*, because as the Tulchan (which is a Calves skin stuff'd with straw) is set up to make the Cow give down her milk; so are such Bishops set up, that their Lords by them may milk the Bishopricks. Likewise Mr. Knox preached against it the tenth of February, and in both their hearings (*Morton's*, and his Arch-bishop) to their Faces pronounced, *Anathema danti, Anathema accipienti*.

And (l) 'We shewed before, how in matters of Church-government, he ever inclined (as the most politique Course) to the state of Bishops. The Name was yet retained by Customs, the Rents were lifted also by them (as we have said) more for other Mens use and profit, than their own. They had also place and vote in Parliament after the old manner, and he would gladly have had them to have kept their Power and Jurisdiction over their Brethren. Master John Dowglass being dead, he fill'd the place by putting in Mr. Patrick Adamson his domestick Chaplain, who then followed that Course, tho' before he had preach'd against it. Many were displeas'd herewith, all the Ministers (especially they of the greatest Authority) and all Men of Estates that were best affected to Religion. (And which he cites out of an English Historian *Francis Botewill*) (m) 'As touching his (*viz. Morton's*) setting up and maintaining the estate of Bishops (whereof there had ensued great debate and contention betwixt him and the Ministry) he said, it did not proceed of an ill mind, of any malice, or contempt of them, or their Callings, but meerly out of want of better knowledge, thinking that Form of Government to be most conform to the Rules of

'Policy, and to be fittest for the times. That if he had then known better, he would have done otherways. And (n) *He* (viz. Morton) was also calm-----this appeared in his carriage toward Mr. Knox, who had used him roughly, and rebuk'd him sharply for divers things, but especially for his labouring to set up and maintain the estate of Bishops.

Hence 'tis most manifest how, not only *Knox*, but also the whole body of our Church disliked and hated the very first bud, and likeness of Prelacy: and how by meer force and fraud of the voracious Court-politicians upon the dishonesty of some, but the unwariness and faintness of many moe of the Ministry. These monstrous *Tulchans*, for all men even our present Prelatists are ashamed of them, got that minot's harbour in *Scotland*.

§. 7. Our Author Answers, for he insists long on this matter, (o) *That the Question is not now, how this was done, but if it was done? For if it was done, it is an Argument that the Clergy then thought little on the indispensibility of Parity.* Just as if what any man either by Fraud or Force is made seemingly to yeeld to, were to be taken for his true and genuine Sentiments: I thought this kind of reasoning had been peculiar to a *Spanish Inquisitor* or *French Converter*. Or that they were bad Men (continues he) a hard construction: For then *Hierome* of *Prague* who was forc'd, and so many of the choice Fathers of the Council of *Arminum*, who were trick'd to admit, in appearance, something contrary to their true Sentiments; shall all be bad men? That the Ministers at this Convention at *Leith* dealt most unwarily, and some of 'em also with too little integrity, is beyond scruple: But that all of 'em, or most of 'em were poor covetous Rogues &c. neither *Petrie* nor any of his Perswasion ever affirmed.

He adds that the Courts Arguments for the *Leith*-establiment were mainly *Politick*; for they turn'd not Theologues to perswade *Episcopacy's* Divine Institution from Scripture &c. Well then, there was little true Piety, no consulting of Conscience or the Word of God in the Matter: And if some of the Ministry, as he says, were taken with these politick and state Reasons, they in so far fell from their own Principle viz. (p) *That in the Books of the Old and New Testament, all things necessary for the instruction of the Church, and to make the Man of God perfect, are contain'd and sufficiently express'd.* But the Clergy (saith he) had found that the new Scheme of the first Book of Discipline had done much hurt to the Church. As if the old



Seet. 8. *examin'd and disprov'd.*

57

Popish Scheme, under which the Churches goods, by God's Law destined for the promoval of piety and learning, and sustaining of the poor, were consum'd and debauch'd, in upholding the grandour and luxury of a spurious ecclesiastick Nobility, could have been really more profitable to the Church than that of the Book of Discipline, on of the prime designs whereof was the bestowing of the Church Revenues for these their true uses, to which God's Law had appointed them. Or as if Pastors, Schools, and Poor can in no place be provided for, where the Romish Church-policy is wanting. But,

*The six Commissioners (saith he) that treated with the State at Leith were sensible Men, and far from being Parity-men. Just so far from being Parity-men, that most of 'em, in an Assembly 1580. July 12. deliberately found and declared Episcopacy unlawfull in it self. (q)*

He intimats, that the Courts motive for the Leith-establishment could not be their desire to possess the Churches Patrimony. An untruth, as we have now seen, too bare fac'd to need more refutation. His proof hereof is of the same stamp, viz. *Had the Clergy fall'n so suddenly from their constant claim to the Churches Revenues? did that which moved them to be so earnest for this meeting with the State miraculously slip out of their minds. Seeing not the Church, but the Court-politicians, as is evident, with desire to circum-veen her, chiefly procur'd that meeting, and if these Delegates were either the only or first men, who by sinistrous Artifices fell into a bad Compact, then let him exclaim with admiration of this matter: what follows is yet odder, viz. Was it not as easy for the Court to have possessed themselves of a Bishoprick, an Abbacy, a Priory &c. when there were no Bishops ----- as when there were.* For he's to be pitied if he be ignorant that the Courtiers having no Law-title thereto, had no hope save under covert of their own Creatours, these titular Bishops, of any peaceable and secure possession of the Churches Revenues.

*But an undoubted Assembly [saith he] own'd the Leith convention as an Assembly, and its Authority as the Authority of an Assembly-----and for several years after that establishment at Leith, beside which there was no other fond for owning them for Bishops, Bishops were present, and as such were obliged to sit and vote in general Assemblies-----and many Acts of subsequent Assemblies put this matter beyond all probability of ever being controverted as the Assembly in August 1574. which petitioneth the Regent, that Stipends be gran-*

(q) Calderwood's Ms. Hist. Vol. 2. Page 597.



ed to Superintendents in all time coming, in all Countries destitute thereof, whether it be where there is no Bishop, or where there are Bishops, who cannot discharge their Office as the Bishop of St. Andrews and Glasgow. And that his Grace would provide qualified Persons for vacant Bishopricks. But this, tho' it be his prime Argument, is soon removed, our Church knew that divers Ministers and others had been allur'd, or aw'd to that agreement: She knew that 'twas only made for the *Interim* (r) and for the *Interim* only did she tolerate it, with a full resolution to have a more perfect Order. (s) And as for the words, *In all time coming*, there's not a syllable of them in the Act he cites (t.) Nor indeed any where else of all the Acts of these Assemblies. She knew also that during that *Interim*, 'twas impossible to get, that which had been the Revenues of Popish Bishops & other Church Rents out of the Regent and other Courtiers their hands. In the mean while the vast number of unplanted Churches, weakness of the Ministry in divers parts, and unsettlement, even unto that time, of the Churches Affairs, allow'd for a space the continuance of Evangelistick Superintendents or Commissioners, who were to be in almost perpetual motion and travels, and therefore needed much larger maintainance then did fixed Pastors; which large maintainance the Church, being thus strip'd of her Patrimony, could not afford to the number that was needfull. On these and such Grounds, the Church indulg'd to that Convention the name of an *Assembly*, tolerated in these *Tulchans* the name of *Bishops*: And, seeing they had got more Rent then was giv'n to ordinary Ministers, allowed them to exercise the Labour and Travel of Superintendents or Commissioners: And thus the Church made the best she might of that their unlawfull Bargain. And tho', (u) which he also objects, *some Assemblies allow Bishops to convene and proceed against delinquents, command Ministers by their Letters to admonish concerning persons to be excommunicated*, it helps him nothing, seeing the very Acts he cites give no less power to Superintendents, yea to Commissioners, whom yet the Church us'd, even after she had declared Episcopacy unlawfull in it self. So far is our Churches tolerating for a space these *Tulchans* from being any Argument, that she believ'd not the *Divine Right of Pa- rity*. But how appears't (saith he) that our Church receiv'd the *Leith Articles* only for an *Interim* out of a dislike to *Episcopacy*: ----- And there

(r) See *Spotswood Hist.* Page 260. (s) *Cald. Ms. Hist.* Vol. 2, Page 334  
 (t) See Page 457. (u) See our Author Pages 207, 208.

were other things in the Articles which required amendment. But sure these Articles were without any exception receiv'd and tolerated only for the Interim, and how well these Court-bishops were liked, is already made manifest, and our Churches subsequent actions declare, which never rested, but still wrestled against the storms of both Power and Policy, untill they were sent packing. 'Tis true, as he says, the Church met with *Opposition*; but that this was only from these titular Bishops, and Rent-gatherers to the Courtiers, supported with all the might, Wit and Artifice of an awfull gripping, politick Regent, and no few other potentand subtle Courtiers driving their own ends, as has already appeared, and is most evident from the best accounts now extant of these Affairs, and this is the undoubted Cause, why the six Collocutors at the Assembly in August 1775, think it not expedient presently to answer directly to the Question of the Function of Bishops. But he who stilleth the noise of the Seas & the noise of their waves, having restrain'd these impetuous Tempests, how cordially did our Church proceed to the utter extirpation of Prelacy? Forasmuch (they are the words of the Assembly holden at Dundee, Anno 1780. July 12. Sess. 4. (x)) as the Office of a Bishop, as it is now used and commonly taken within this Realme, hath no sure warrant, authority, or good ground out of the Book, and Scriptures of God, but brought in by the folly and corruption of mens invention, to the great overthrow of the true Kirk of God, the whole Assembly of the Kirk in one voice, after liberty given to all Men to reason in the matter, none opposing themselves in defence of the said pretended Office, findeth and declareth the same pretended Office, used and termed as is above said, unlawfull in the self, as having neither fundament, ground nor warrant in the word of God &c. And in all this, our Church, as she clearly here expresses, did nothing save what she was oblig'd to do by her own Principle in the first Book of Discipline, which affirms that all thing necessary for the instruction of the Church is contain'd in the Books of the Old and New Testament. And that whatsoever is without express commandment of God's Word, is to be repress'd as damnable to Salvation. Our Reformers therefore, except our Adversaries say, (which even impudence, it self dare not say), that they believ'd the Hierarchy to be founded on the express command of God's Word, were bound by this their Principle to oppose it as a manifest corruption, and according to this Principle, whensoever Prelacy, by force of the secular arm, and fraud of ser-

(x) Cald. Ms. Hist. Vol. 2. Page 597.

pentine policy, and, as one well words it, *by terrors and allurements, crosses and commodities, banishment and benefices* (for by other means it could never be admitted) overwhelm'd this Land, and discover'd the Hypocritie or *Gallio-like* Disposition of many; all the true Lovers of our Reformation still then had, in greater or lesser measure, as their love was to this truly Protestant, yea truly Catholick and Christian Principle of our Reformers, their Feasts turned into Mourning, their Songs into Lamentation, their Tears for Meats, and their Harps hang'd on the Willows. And now suppose that our Reformers, in that unstable condition of our Church, and very first rudiments of Protestantism had in some of their Doings or Sayings afforded some colour or appearance, either for the scruples of the curious, or the quirks and cavils of the captious, does not, pray, this most unanimous, most clear, and every way most unexceptionable Act of our most full and free General Assembly, that consisted for the far greater part of the very same Men, who were the Actors and Promoters of our first Reformation, most fully open our Reformers their minds, shew their ultimate tendency and scope, and finally, for ever determine the present Controversie.

§. 8. He hath more to say of *John Knox*, I return therefore to attend him. His next Plea (y) is with *Calderwood* about *Beza's* Letter to *Knox*, where he denies that *Beza* wrote being inform'd by *Knox* of the Courts intention to bring in Bishops, and adds, *that if any thing of Knox's Sentiments can be collected from Beza's Letter, it seems rather he was for Prelacy than for Presbytry*: For *Beza* (saith he) seems clearly to import, that *Knox* needed to be caution'd against Prelacy. *Beza's* Words are. (z) But I would have you, my dear *Knox*, and the other Brethren, to Remember that which is before your eyes: that as Bishops brought forth the Papacy: so false Bishops the reliques of Popery, shall bring in Epicurism to the World: They that desire the Churches good and safety, let them take heed of this Pest, and seeing we have put that Plague to flight timorously, I heartily pray you, that Ye never admit it again, albeit it seem plausible, with the pretence or colour of keeping unity, which pretence deceiv'd the ancient Fathers, yea even many of the best of 'em.

Where *Beza* without giving any proof thereof, clearly supposes as a thing believed by *Knox* no less than by himself, that the Bishops whom

(y) Page 28. Et sequentibus. (z) Epist. 79. Sed & istud mi Knoxe—  
sicut Episcopi Papatum pepererunt. ita pseudopiscopos— (Papatus reliqui-  
as) Epicureissimum terras invaduros &c.

some

some were then labouring to introduce into *Scotland* were false Bishops, the relics of Popery, which had already been once driv'n out of *Scotland*, and on this supposition, as any Orators use to do from Principles common to themselves, and these to whom they are speaking, he admonish'd him and the rest to beware of this Plague. Certain it is then, if we believe *Beza*, that he knew, if by a Letter from *Knox*, or otherwise concerns not the matter in hand, that *Knox* judg'd the Bishops then to be introduc'd to be no others than were the Popish Bishops, whom *Knox* and his fellow Reformers had lately expuls'd *Scotland*, and both sorts of Bishops to be equally false and Anti-christian. And now consider this Letter of *Beza* written near the same time with that of *Knox* to the Assembly, and the disinterested shall soon perceive that the former explains the latter, and sufficiently shews what *Knox* meant by the *Tyranny* mention'd therein. Moreover, whosoever finds so much against Episcopacy in *Beza*, even tho' it had been spoken by him without any relation or respect to *Knox*, and remembers how universal and firm Concord was between these excellent Persons,

*Qui duo corporibus mentibus unus erant,*

will easily conclude that *Knox* bore but small kindness to Prelacy.

§. 9. He comes next to prove, *Knox was not for Parity*. Had he been (saith he) so perswaded, how seasonable had it been for him to have spoken out so much, when he was brought before King Edward's Council? The Question was then put to him, whether he thought that no Christian might serve in the Ecclesiastical Ministration, according to the Rites and Laws of the Realm of England? ----- Yet he answer'd nothing, but that no Minister in England had Authority to separate the Lepers from the whole, which was a chief part of his Office. Plainly sounding all the unlawfulness of being a Pastor of the Church of England, not only the unlawfulness of the Hierarchy which he spoke not one word about, but on the Kings retaining ----- the chief Power of Ecclesiastical Discipline. As if *Knox* had judg'd nothing in the Church of England unlawfull but the King's retaining the Ecclesiastical Discipline in his own hand; which all Men, even Episcopals no less than Presbyterians, know to be an arch and palpable untruth. Does not (as for example) our Assembly Anno 1566. in a Letter to the English Bishops and Pastors, being moved thereto by John Knox, if Spotswood (a) speak truth, expressly, among many other things to this purpose, say

(a) Hist. Pages 198, 199.

62 *The Fundamentals of the Hierarchy* Part I.  
*If Surplice, Corner-cap, and Tippet have been the badges of Idolaters, in the very act of their Idolatry, what have the Preachers of Christian Liberty, and the Rebukers of Superstition, to do with the dregs of that Roman Beast? yea, what is he that ought not to fear either to take in his hand or fore-head the Print & Mark of that odious Beast? &c. See store to this purpose in Heylins' History of the Presbyterians: whereby 'tis most evident, that this Author endeavour'd nothing more earnestly than to perswade the World that Knox was a self-repugnant Idiot.*

It sufficed if before that celebrated Assembly he answer'd to the Question, and gave some one reason that shewed he could not comply with them, tho' he declar'd not all the grounds of his dislike of their Practice.

As to the matter of *Francfort*, which this Author mentions, drawing from it the like Consequences, there was no Bishop there, nor any mention of the necessity thereof, but only a bustle made by some superstitious Bigots for their *Popish Ceremonies or Fooleries*, as *Calvin* calls them, and so there was no occasion of venting himself in this matter, and tho' there had, he sufficiently declar'd his mind while publickly in a Sermon, he alledged (b) that nothing ought to be thrust upon any Congregation without the warrant of the Word of God. Yea, if we may believe *Le Strange* (c) *Knox* and his Associates sufficiently discover'd themselves to be of the *Consistorian* or *Presbyterian* Perswasion.

§. 10. He adds that *Knox* in his Appellation &c. plainly supposes the lawfulness of the *Episcopal Office*. I deny t. But all alongst throw it (saith he) *Knox* appeals to a lawfull general Council, such a Council as the most ancient Laws and Canons approve, and who knows not that the most ancient Laws and Canons made Bishops the chief, if not the only Members of such Councils. *Knox* says, if the *Popish Clergy* his Adversaries are for it, he's content that matters in Controversie between him and them be determin'd by the Testimony and Authority of Doctors and Councils, three thin's being granted him, whereof these are two. 1. That the most ancient Councils nearest to the primitive Church in which the learned and godly Fathers examined all Matters by God's Word, may be holden of most Authority. 2. That no Determinations of Councils or Men be admitted against the plain verity of God's Word, nor against the Determinations of the four chief Councils. Would *Knox* if he had been *Presbyterian* have agreed so frankly to have stood by the Determination of these four chief Councils? Could he have expected they would have favoured the *Drum*

(b) *Cald.* Page 3. (c) *Holy Cheat.* Pages 31, 32.

*Right*

*Right of Presbyterian Parity? Will any Scottish Presbyterian now adays stand to the Decision of these four chief Councils?*

But all our Author here infers is by *Knox* prevented and cut off, while, in the first place, he requires, *that no Determinations of Councils nor Men be admitted against the plain Verity, i. e. (d) without the expressed commandment of God's Word.*

We cheerfully appeal in the present Controversie, and provoke our Adversaries to this Rule, which most of 'em I have hitherto met with; expressly acknowledge to contain nothing in their favours.

*Secondly*, The Actions of the first four Councils were of two sorts, *Cree ds viz. and Canons.* Now, as *John Knox* and all the Presbyterians in cordial subscribing to the former, *viz. The Symbols* of these Councils, are confessedly not behind any part of the Christian World: so part of the latter sort, I mean the *Canons*, are rejected by Episcopals no less than by Presbyterians. As for example, the *Constantinopolitan (e)* Council appoints *that reduced Hereticks and Schismaticks must be anointed on the Fore-head, Eyes, Nose, Mouth and Ears.* And in the Council of *Chalcedon (f)* 'tis permitted *only of all the Church-men to the Lectors and Cantors to Marry.* Yea *that none of the Clergy after that manner should Marry,* was statuted by the Council of *Nico. (g)* And they were also to have separated from their Wives the Church-men, who were in Wedlock already, had they not been restrain'd by the grave admonition and solide reason of *Paphnutius. (h)*

Now, 'tis true indeed Presbyterians admit not of these Decrees. But dare they say that *Knox* imbrac'd them? Or, do our present Adversaries themselves receive them? *Knox* therefore spoke of the Symbols: Our Author introduces him, and gives out as if he had spoken of their Canons, to the end he may deceive the vulgar Reader; for none that look into the Councils can be obnoxious to this his Fraud.

(d) First Book of Discipline head first. (e) Cap. 7. καὶ σπράσιζομένους ἥτοι χρίεσθαι πρῶτον τὸ ἀγίον μύρον, π, τ, καὶ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, καὶ τὰς ρίνας καὶ τὸ στήμα καὶ τὸ ὤτι. (f) Can. 14. Ἐπειδὴ ἀπὸ τῶν παρχαίων συγκαταστήται τῆς ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς καὶ λαλταὶς ἱερῶν. (g) Sozomen Lib. 1. Cap. 23. ἐν ᾧ καὶ περὶ τούτου ἀνελύθη, τοῖς μὲν ἀλλοῖς ἐδόκει νόμον ἐκτελεῖν, ἐπισκόπους καὶ πρεσβυτέρους, διακόνους τε καὶ ἀποδισκόνους, μὴ συγκαταθεῖν ταῖς γυναῖκαῖς ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν ἡγαγόντο. (h) Socrates. Lib. 1. Cap. 11. ἐδόκει τοῖς ἐπισκόποις νόμον λαβεῖν εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν εἰσελθεῖν, ὥς τοὺς ἱερομένους, μὴ συγκαταθεῖν ταῖς γυναῖκαῖς, &c.

The



The same conclusion, viz. *That Knox supposes the innocency and lawfulness of the Episcopal Office*, he would deduce from *Knox's* following words. 'You may in a peaceable manner, without Sedition, withhold the fruits and profits which your false Bishops and Clergy most unjustly receive of you, untill such time as they shall faithfully do their Charge and Duties, which is to preach unto you Christ Jesus truly; rightly to minister the Sacraments according to his Institution; and so to watch for your Souls as is commanded by Christ &c. But might not *Knox*, had he been there, giv'n the like admonition to the *Romans* concerning their Bishop and Clergy? should he thereby have suppos'd the Lawfulness and Innocency of the Papacy and Power the Romanists gave to the Pope.

Secondly, Does not *Knox* admonish the People concerning the rest of the Clergy wherein there was comprehended the *Abbots, Priors*, and all the rest of the Romish rout, no less then concerning the Bishops? Did therefore *Knox* suppose the Innocency and Lawfulness of all these Offices?

Thirdly, *Knox* utterly baffles all our Author's Sophistry, and sufficiently preserves himself from his abuses and depravations, while he places the Office of all true Bishops in *truly preaching of Christ Jesus, rightly ministering the Sacraments and watching for Souls*: Which I hope is equally the Office and Duty of all Christ's Ministers. So true is it, we observ'd from *Beza's* Letter, that *Knox* look'd on all Lordly Diocesan Prelats as false Bishops. And all they pretend to, beside what is common to every Pastor under whatsoever Name or Profession they go, as unwarrantable and unjust.

But (saith our Author) *Knox's* great Work in his *Admonition to the Professors of England*, was to enumerat the Causes, which in God's righteous Judgement brought Queen *Maries* Persecution on them: But he quite forgot to name the Sin of Prelacy as one; *Ergo &c.* And did he enumerat and reckon up all things he judg'd to be Errors or Sins wherefore God was pleading with the *English*, and had sent among them that Persecution? The truth is the main design of that Admonition is not to give an accurat enumeration of the Causes of the Persecution, but to give comfort to the Faithfull under it. But abstracting what *Knox* thought to be the Causes of that Persecution, and what not, our Author must sustain that *Knox* reckon'd up whatsoever he judg'd to be Sins and



and Abuses in that Church, otherwise he does nothing. But dare he say, that *Knox* there did so? Spoke he ever a word of *the Tippet, Corner-cap, and Surplice, there being Badges of Idolaters, and Marks of the odious Beast?* Hath he one syllable of *Christmas, Feasts and such holy Days,* (1) which he also judged superstitious and sinfull? Or of the Faults of their Service-book about which, as all Men know, fell out the Controversie at *Francfort?* or the depriving Ministers of *Power to separate the Lepers from the whole?* at which our Author grants *Knox* to have been offended.

But *Knox* calls *Cranmer* that reverend Father in God; Ergo, *Bellè*. As if forsooth *Knox* might not use a Phrase of the common stile of the times, but he must be presently concluded a propugner of the Hierarchy. (k) Was not at the Assembly in *Edinburgh March 1570.* whereof *John Knox* was a Member, one of the Heads of *Adam Bishop of Orkney's Accusation*, which by the Assembly he was desir'd to redress, 'that he stileth himself with Roman Titles, as *Reverend Father in God*, which pertaineth to no Ministers of Christ Jesus, nor is giv'n 'them in Scriptures?

*John Knox* (continues our Author) said, the false Religion of *Mahomet* is more ancient than *Papistry*, yea *Mahomet* had established his *Alcoran* before any *Pope* of *Rome* was crown'd with a triple Crown &c. 'Can any 'Man think (subjoins our Author) *John Knox* was so very unlearn'd 'as to imagine *Episcopacy* was not much Older than *Mahomet?* Or 'knowing it to be Older, that yet he could have been so ridiculous, as 'to have thought it a reliſt of *Popery*, which he himself affirm'd to be 'Younger than *Mahometism?* But, was *Knox* so very unlearn'd, as not to know, that divers *Popish Errors* and *Dotages* had generally obtain'd and got good footing before the time of *Mahomet?* Do not these who know any thing, know so much? Have we not heard how he rejected, as unwarrantable and unlawfull, *Christmas, Feasts, and such holy Days?* Will our Author acknowledge they obtain'd not before the rise of *Mahomet*, or the *Pope's* triple Mitre? I think he will not. Have we not seen how, good space before these times, other Innovations as unſtion of *Pœnitents*, and *Calibacy* of Church-men were coming in fashion, and countenanc'd by the most famous Councils. *Knox* had been unlearn'd indeed, if he had not known so much; he spoke therefore on-

(i) *Spisw. Hist.* 153. 174. (k) *Cald. Ms. Hist.* Vol. 2. Page 143.

ly of the maturity and more open appearance of the Man of Sin, and as he expresses, of his coming to his *triple Crown*; and meant not at all that before Mahomer's time, no Popish Doctrines were generally broach'd and imbrac'd: yet so our Author (otherwise he's quite beside his purpose) makes him to speak; then which nothing more false and injurious to Mr. Knox, can be express'd.

Hitherto, we have been intertain'd with Sophistry so silly, and Paralogisms so palpable, that 'twere injustice done to this Gentle-man's Intellectuals, not to believe that he sufficiently discern'd the Fallacies. But he promiseth to make a mends for the future; as yet, he has only brought up his *Rorarios* and *Velites*, but now the case is quite alter'd.

*Ecce ferunt Troes ferrumque Ignesque Jovemque!*

§. II. He has yet more to say; yes, more with a Witness! Knox says, in his *Exboation* to England, 'Let no man be charg'd in preaching of Jesus Christ above that a man may do; I mean that your Bishopricks be so divided that of every one as they are now for the most part, may be ten, and so in every City and great Town, there may be plac'd a godly learned Man, with so many join'd with him for Preaching and Instruction as shall be thought sufficient for the bounds committed to their Charge. But the Reader, impartially weighing what we have adduced, must yeeld, that 'tis impossible, either from this, or any other place, to make Knox a *Prelatist*, except we involve him in manifest self-repugnancy, which there is no necessity to do for any thing here said: For tho' Knox, considering how the *English* were wedded to something of a hierarchick Splendor, had indulged them in a good deal thereof: it had been only a parallel Action to that of his Friend Calvin, who (1) tho' sufficiently Anti-ceremonial, yeelds, notwithstanding, for a time, and for Peace's sake, to that Nation, some of their Ceremonies which he calls *tolerable Fooleries*, *unprofitable Triffles* &c. Yet I have met with none, who on this score has taxed Calvin of Self-contradiction. But this *ex abundanti*; for they cannot from these Knox's words conclude, that he favoured so much as the least grain of the substance of Prelacy: of each of their Bishopricks he makes ten, which I think will bring his Lordship comparatively consider'd, to a very narrow compass. But to shew that he put a definit number for an indefinit, he gives not only to every City, but to every great Town a Bishop: Now, of Cities and Mercar.

(1) *Vide Epist. 205. Coxo & gregalibus suis.*

Sect. 8. *examin'd and disprov'd.* 67  
 towns in *England*, which, there, are not inconsiderable, there are odds of  
 600, (m) But that none may justly cavill, let's make a large abatement  
 of the number where they may be smaller; and yet, I'm sure, so many  
 remain as there should be ordinary Presbyteries in *England*, providing it  
 were so divided.

Moreover, the great End and Work of this Bishop *Knox* makes to  
 be the preaching of the Gospel, and instructing of the People; of his  
 Dominion and Power over the Clergy not a syllable; yea, he gives not  
 to him alone the Charge of the Flock, 'tis *their Charge*, the Charge  
 of the rest, no less than the Bishop; they are join'd with him, not his  
 Curats under him: And we have heard him already making the Office  
 of a Bishop nothing else but what is common to all Pastors: And, if his  
 Doctrine and Practice in *Scotland* may be allow'd as an Explication of his  
*Exhortation to England*, this Bishop was subject to the Admonition  
 and Correction of the Presbytry, wherein he was Bishop

Nothing therefore can necessarily be drawn from *Knox's* words, ex-  
 cept that this Bishop was to have (if Temporary or continued, I dis-  
 pute not, for it touches not the present Question) a meer presidency of  
 Order or Moderator-ship; nothing of Dominion or Power to *Knox's*  
 Bishop. Nothing therefore of imparity amongst Pastors can from the  
 words in hand with any good consequence be deduced.

Lastly, whatever 'twas, it appears clear from these words, that he al-  
 low'd this only for a time, during the rarity of Preachers.

§. 12. But hear somewhat more of the same *Exhortation*. 'Touch-  
 ing the Reformation of Religion (saith he (n)) ye must at once so  
 'purge and expell all dregs of Papistry, Superstition and Idolatry, that  
 'thou, O England, must judge and hold execrable and accursed, what-  
 'soever God hath not sanctify'd to thee by his blessed Word, or by the  
 'Action of our Master Jesus Christ. The glistering beauty of vain Ce-  
 'remonies, the heaps of things pertaining nothing to Edification, by  
 'whomsoever they were invented, justify'd or maintain'd, ought at once  
 'to be removed, and so troden under the obedience of God's Word,  
 'that continually this sentence should be present in thy Heart, and ready  
 'in thy Mouth, not that which appeareth in thine own Eye shalt thou  
 'do &c. Deut. 12.-----Let not then the King and his proceedings,  
 'whatsoever they be, not agreeable to the Lord's Holy Word, be a

(m) Heylin's Cosmography. Page 305. (n) Page 108. Et sequentibus.

'snare to thy Conscience.-----Let God's blessed Word alone be the Rule  
 'and Line to measure his Majestie's Religion. What it commandeth, let  
 'it be obeyed, & what it commandeth not, let that be execrable, because  
 'it hath not the sanctification of God's Word, under what Title or  
 'Name soever it be published. Halt no longer on both parts. Let not  
 'these Voices prevail in your Parliament, This to our Judgement is  
 'good and godly, this the People cannot well bear, this repugneth not  
 'to God's Word. And, 'But let his holy and blessed Ordinances by  
 'Christ Jesus commanded to his Kirk, be within thy limits and bounds  
 'so sure, and established, that if Prince, King, or Emperour would en-  
 'terprize to change or disannull the same, that he be the reputed En-  
 'emy of God.-----Which horrible Crimes if ye will avoid in time com-  
 'ing, then must ye (I mean the Princes, Rulers, and People of the Re-  
 'alm) by solemn Covenant renew the Oath betwixt God and you.-----  
 'That benefice upon benefice be heaped upon no Man, but that a suffi-  
 'ent Charge with a competent Stipend be assigned to the Work-men;  
 'for O how horrible was that confusion that one Man should be permit-  
 'ted to have two, three, four, five, six, or seven Benefices, who scarce-  
 'ly in the year did so often preach; yea, that a Man should have the  
 'Charge of them, whose faces he never saw.-----For the great Do-  
 'minions and Charge of your proud Prelats (impossible by one Man to  
 'be discharged) are no part of Christ's true Ministry, but are the main-  
 'tainance of the Tyranny first invented, and yet retain'd by the Roman  
 'Antichrist. That diligent heed be taken, that such to whom the Of-  
 'fice of preaching is committed, discharge and do their Duties: for it  
 'is not; nor will not be the chanting nor mummelling over of certain  
 'Psalters, the reading of Chapters for matines & evening Song, or of ho-  
 'milies only (be they never so godly) that can feed the Souls of hun-  
 'gry Sheep.-----What efficacy the living voice hath above the naked  
 'letter which is read, the hungry and thirsty do feel to their comfort.  
 'But the other maketh for Mr. *Parson's* purpose, who, retaining in his  
 'hand a number of Benefices, and appointed such in his place as are al-  
 'together destitute of the Gift of Preaching; but let all such Belly-gods  
 'be whipp'd out of God's Holy Temple. Let none that be appointed  
 'to labour in Christ's Vineyard be intangl'd with Civil Affairs.-----ex-  
 'cept it be when the Civil Magistrat and the Minister of the Word as-  
 'semble together for Execution of Discipline, which is a thing easie to  
 'be

'be done without withdrawing any Person from his Charge, if that  
'which was before express'd be observed: For as touching their yearly  
'coming to Parliament for matters of Religion, it shall be superfluous  
'& vain, if God's true Religion be once so established that after, it never  
'be called in controversie. And as touching Execution of Discipline  
'that must be done in every City and Shire, where the Magistrats and  
'Ministers are join'd together without any respect of Persons. So that  
'the Ministers, albeit they lake the glorious Title of Lords, and the Di-  
'velish Pomp which before appear'd in proud Prelats, yet must they be  
'so stout, and so bold in God's Cause, that if the King would usurp any o-  
'ther Authority in God's Religion than becometh a Member in Christ's  
'Body, that first he be admonished according to God's Word &c.

Read pray, the rest of this *Exhortation*, and you shall find that never  
was light more opposite to darkness, than *Knox* is to their Ceremonies  
and Hierarchy, and, in a word, their whole way whatsoever they con-  
tend for in opposition to the Church of *Scotland*. Now suppose, which  
yet he is far from doing, that *Knox* allow'd them some umbrage of im-  
parity, should they not, notwithstanding, providing they closed with  
what he saith here and elsewhere, really relinquish what they call the  
Church-of-*England's* way, and come over unto us? Yea, were they  
according to *Knox's Exhortation* stript of the hope their exorbitant  
Gain, Ease, and Grandour, &c: they should soon also send packing  
their Plea for Imparity, 'tis being a meer shrowd, and pretext to cover  
these Enormities from which *Knox* so warmly dehorts, and which with  
less colour of modesty can be sustain'd.

Add hereto, that seeing *Knox* so zealously requires express and posi-  
tive Warrant in the Word of God for every thing in the Worship, Go-  
vernment and Discipline of the Church; and seeing hitherto none hath  
dared to avert, that he was for the Divine Right of Prelacy, yea even  
our Author himself adventures not plainly to assert so much, but only  
labours to make *Knox* to account it Lawfull and Innocent, and to speak  
nothing against it, it must undeniably follow, that he was for a Divine  
Right of Parity.

§. 13. Did not *Knox* (continues our Author) write and bear the Letter  
sent by the Superintendents, Ministers and Commissioners of the Church with-  
in the Realm of Scotland, to their Brethren the Bishops and Pastors in Eng-  
land, Anno 1566? Did not he in that same Title of that same Letter acknow-

ledge, that these Brethren, Bishops and Pastors of England had renounc'd the Roman Antichrist, and profess'd the Lord Jesus in sincerity? And doth not the Letter all alongst allow of the Episcopal Power and Authority of these English Bishops? But, had never a Protestant to do with an Abbot, Prior, or some other such Popish Officers, whose Offices he did not allow? Might he not therefore speak or write to him in such Terms without which he should either not have been understood, or his Letter, or his Discourse been altogether uneffectual? Altho' then it could be prov'd, they had given Bishops the distinguishing Titles they assume, by no good Logick could it be infer'd that they account'd the Office, as it is distinguish'd from any other Pastor, Lawfull: which yet can never be prov'd, nor any thing concluded from the Letter, save that they took Bishop and Pastor for synonymous Terms.

Moreover, 'twill no more follow, that they count Episcopacy Lawfull, than that they esteem so of the Surplice, Corner-cap and Tippet, which yet in the same Letter, they make the Marks of the odious Beast. They there indeed acknowledge the English to have renounc'd the Roman Antichrist, but so as notwithstanding to have retain'd divers of his Abominations, whereof they name none, but only the most notorious of these which the then present English Controversies gave occasion to mention.

The rest of his Discourse on this Head leans on this, that our Superintendents were really *Diocesan* Bishops, of whom more anon. And well may I deny't, were there no more than the Doctrine and Practice of John Knox, who, as our Author grants, compil'd the *first Book of Discipline*, wherein the Appointment and Duties of Superintendents are set down.

§. 14. And indeed that Knox was truly Presbyterian, is so manifest, that untill now, when Men have broke the bonds of all modesty, and abandon'd themselves to averr every thing to be as they would have it, was in neither hand call'd in question, but Enemies no less than Friends, either more indirectly or more plainly acknowledg'd it. *This was the Policy* (saith (o) Spotswood) *desired to be ratifi'd. It had been formed by John Knox, partly in imitation of the Reformed Churches of Germany, partly of that which he had seen in Geneva &c.* Nothing then from England, which flatly contradicts our Author, who, throw no small part of his Book, pretends to prove that all was taken especially from England.



Now, what was the Government of the reformed Churches of Germany and Geneva, I think few are ignorant. And elsewhere, (p) *Many good Men* (saith Spotswood) *have disliked some of Knox's Opinions, as touching the Authority of Princes, and the Form of Government which he laboured to have established in the Church.* The Prelat indeed here, as his custom is, delivers the Truth as sparingly, as may be; yet not so, but both Presbyterians can perceive, and Hierarchicks must confess what is wrapt up in this forced Confession: And while he endeavours yet more to obscure it, by impertinently adding, that *Knox* was always urging the Obedience of Ministers to their Superintendents, he only hereby shews, that he was loath the World should know, that he had been forc'd to Confess that *Knox* was really a Presbyterian. But their own dearest Friends and Brethren gave Testimony against them. *Knox* (say they (q)) *was of the Consistorian stamp.* These *sc.* Gilby, Goodman and Whittingham led the dance in England, *Knox* in Scotland, and at this day our Presbyterians do but write after their Copy, professing the same Principles, pretending the same Scruples, and beyond doubt proposing the same end. (r) *Let me be understood likewise by Presbyterians to intend these of the Scottish Race, to whom we are beholden for our Discipline.* That Faction first advanc'd it self by popular Tumult and Rebellion, *Knox* learned the Trick of it at Geneva, and brought it into Scotland. I forbear to cite others: see in lieu of many *Heylin's History of the Presbyterians*, who is most ample to this purpose.

I only Note how various Methods have been us'd to destroy our Reformed Religion: The Papists, when the Divine Light of the Gospel began to break throw their Babilonish Fogs, to other means for extinguishing thereof, added that of lying, reproaching and bespattering most odiously our first Reformers, endeavouring to ridicul and expose, together with their Doctrine, their Discipline also, and Government, which they saw like to obtain amongst most of the reformed, and which sometimes in scorn they named after *Geneva*; but they were open and profess'd Enemies, and so the Net was laid in sight of the Bird: A new Squadron must be added who, under the name of *Protestant*, may better manage the *Romish* Design,

*Tuta frequensque Via est per amici fallere nomen.*

These in the mean while with open mouth proclaim'd this Truth, that *Knox*, and the rest of our first Reformers in Scotland, were, no less than

(p) Hist. Pag. 266. (q) See *L'estrang's* holy Cheat. Page 31. (r) Pag. 133. *Calvin*,



*Calvin, Beza,* and such transmarine Propagators of the Gospel, truly Presbyterian, and, as they scornfully spoke, *fiery Zelots of the new holy Genevan Discipline*: And on this very account threw upon them all the Iniquity, Asperſion and Infamy their black Art could invent, or the ſpirit of Lies and Malice ſuggeſt. Yet with all good Men and true Proteſtants they effected nothing, ſave to bring themſelves into juſt ſuſpicion of being masked Romaniſts: ſome of 'em therefore of late, find it there intereſt to alter their Method, & to forbear ſomewhat to utter their wonted Calumnies, and Malice againſt the perſons of our Reformers (for as for ſpeaking any good of 'em, we ſhall moſt rarely find them do it, or if ever, 'tis done with ſo much coldneſs and lameneſs, and with ſuch mixtures of detraction, that they appear content that the Reader believe them not, and reſolved to pull back with the one hand, what they were compell'd to give with the other) and in the mean while, averr with an unparallel'd confidence, that theſe our Reformers were never for the *Genevan* way, (as they call it) were never for Parity of Paſtors or Presbyterian Government; that ſo they may the more ſecurely follow the ſteps of the former, and vent their ſplene at both Government and Diſcipline, and yet be leſs obnoxious to ſuſpicion of driving *Rome's* intereſt. But 'tis to be hop'd they ſhall not ſpeed well, ſeeing herein, they only endeavour to darken the Sun, to contradiſt what's known and believ'd all *Europe*-over: And loudly, finally, to give the lie to their own deareſt Friends.

§. 15. Now to their ſecond Objection, which is from the *Superintendents*, which, together with whatever elſe they advance from this Argument, we, having thus evinc'd that *Knox*, whoſe Judgement is confeſſedly of ſuch moment in the preſent Caſe, was truly Anti-prelatick, might without juſt blame have neglected, it melts quite away, if we remember that this practice was only a temporary expedient, during the unſettl'd condition of the Church. The Objection dwindles alſo to nothing on this account, that tho' our Reformers had deſign'd the perpetual uſe of Superintendents, yet theſe *isto calo*, as they ſay, differ'd from Dioceſan Prelats, ſo that, notwithstanding hereof, the Government was really Presbyterian, or without ought that can be call'd Imparity. The former of theſe our Answers is plainly ſet down in the *firſt Book of Discipline* (f) *If the Miniſters* (ſay our Reformers) *whom*

(f) Head 5.

God hath endowed with his singular Graces amongst us should be appointed to several places there to make their continual residence, that then the greater part of the Realm should be destitute of all Doctrine: which should not only be the occasion of great murmur, but also be dangerous to the Salvation of many. And therefore we have thought it a thing most expedient at this time, that from the whole number of Godly and learned Men, now presently in this Realme, be Selected ten or twelve (for in so many Provinces we have divided the whole) to whom Charge and Commandment should be given to Plant and Erect Kirks, to set, order, and appoint Ministers, as the former Order prescribes, to the Countries that shall be appointed to their care where none are now.

This was but too plain, and therefore is much curtail'd by Spotswood; (t) as our Author, who dwells long on this Objection from Superintendents (u), cannot deny. He therefore takes a new Way, and thus glosses the Passage. *If I mistake not (saith he.) the true gloss of this Period will amount to no more than this, 'that because there were then so 'few Men qualify'd for the Office of Superintendency, tho' ten or twelve 'were, by far, too small a number for the whole Kingdom, yet, at that 'time, they thought it expedient to establish no more: and tho', 'when the Church should be sufficiently provided with Ministers, it 'would be highly reasonable, that the Superintendents should have 'Places appointed them, for their continual residence; yet, in that juncture, 'twas necessary that they should be constantly travelling through 'their districts, to Preach, and Plant Churches &c. To establish his gloss he says, the Compilers of the first Book of Discipline, viz. Mr. J. Winname, John Spotswood, J. Willock, J. Douglas, J. Row and J. Knox, were still of prelati cal Principles. But tho' this were as true as 'tis false, the quite contrary would rather follow, viz. that they had resolv'd to change afterward the Superintendents for Diocesan Bishops: To prove they were Prelatists, he says, three of them were Superintendents, beginning the Question, as if Superintendent and Bishop were one and the same. But Douglas died Arch-bishop of St. Andrews. But is't strange that he, who, in favours of a Tulchan Bishoprick, had a stomach able to deject Simoniackal Passions and dirty Bargains, made no bones of sacrificing his former Principles to his interest? But Spotswood was a constant Enemy to Parity, as appears from his Son's account of him. But his Son says not so much: Moreover, which quite spoils our Author's Cause,*

(t) Hist. Page 158. (u) Pages 143, & sequentes.

L

he

74 *The Fundamentals of the Hierarchy* Part I.  
 he makes (x) without naming any other, John Knox the Author of that Book of Policy, yea he averrs (y) that in his Father's Judgement, the Old Policy was undoubtedly the better than the New. John Row defended the lawfulness of Episcopacy at the Conference appointed by the General Assembly 1575. But J. Row, no less than the other Collocutors, in their Report to that Assembly, tho', for the iniquity of the time, nor in so many words, yet really condemn'd Prelacy, (z) and was also a Member of that Assembly, which with one voice-----found and declar'd the Office unlawfull in it self. (a) Judge then of his confidence, who yet adventures hence to conclude that he was a Prelatist.

He adds out of Knox, that Superintendents and Overseers were nominated, that all things in the Church might be carried with Order and well, which reason for establishing Superintendents (saith our Author) will continue to hold so long as the Church continues. But let him once prove that Knox speaks of the constant and ordinary Church regimen and guidance, and not of the settling and ordering of a Church little more then in fieri, and as yet not all sufficiently constitute, otherwise we have a meer Paralogism. At the Admission of Spotswood (continues he) John Knox asserted the necessity of Superintendents and Overseers, as well as Ministers the necessity I say, & not the bare expediency in the juncture. The words are (b) first was made a Sermon, in the which these Heads were handled: first the necessity of Ministers and Superintendents or Overseers &c. We have indeed here the necessity of Superintendents mention'd, but that it arose above an expediency, we do not hence learn: That Knox asserted the necessity of Superintendents as well as Ministers, or an equal necessity of the one and the other, can by no means be inferr'd: Yea, who can, with our Author, believe that tho' any People had abundance of sufficient and lawfully ordain'd Ministers, yet, in Knox's Judgement, if Superintendents were wanting, such a People could no more be counted a Church, than if they had no Minister at all?

He brings also some Expressions out of the first Book of Discipline, as, After the Church shall be established, and three years are past, no Man shall be called to the Office of a Superintendent, who hath not two years given a Proof of his faithfull Labours in the Ministry of some Church. Such passages indeed suppose some continuance of Superintendents tho' no perpetuity. For

(x) Page 174. (y) Page 344. (z) Cald. Ms. Hist. Vol. 2. Page 489. (a) Ibid. Page 595. Et seq. (b) Knox Hist. 289.

our Reformers could never think that within three years or thereabout, the Church should be fully established, & few or no Churches to be planted; unto which full settlement, the forecited passage of the Book of Policy allows the use of Superintendents.

*This Book of Discipline* (saith our Author) supposeth that Superintendents and Colledges were to be of equal continuance, for the Superintendent was still to be at the choosing and installment of Principalls and Rectors &c. But this his Argument, he himself overthrows. *The Assembly*, (saith he) *May 27. 1561. addresseth to the Council, that special and certain Provision might be made for the maintenance of the Superintendents, Ministers, Exhorters and Readers &c.* Now, who sees not, that this Address speaks after the same manner concerning all these, so that, using our Author's way of arguing, we should infer, that our Reformers thought the Exhorter (which confessedly was a kind of Function purely temporary) was no less to be perpetual than the Superintendent, yea, or the Minister. And the Assembly at Edinburgh December 25. 1565. (c) appointed Mr. Knox to pen a comfortable Letter in their Name to encourage Ministers, Exhorters and Readers to continue in their Vocation &c. From these and the like Acts he may as well conclude the equal duration of Exhorters and Ministers, as he infers from the Book of Policy, the equal duration of Superintendents and Colledges.

He would next prove, from the account of the Election and Admission of Superintendents, prefix'd to the old Psalms, that, according to our Reformers, this was an Office distinct from that of other Pastors, of Divine Institution, and so perpetual. *The Order and Form* (saith he) for admitting a Superintendent and a Minister, was all one, and there was nothing in it importing the one Office to be temporary, more than the other. But therefore, there's nothing elsewhere importing so much, is a clear non sequitur. In the mean while, from what he grants, 'tis plain that the Superintendent wanted the very specific difference of a Diocesan Bishop, wherefore tho' they us'd this Phrase, *The Office to which God call'd him*, and this Question to the People, *Will ye not acknowledge this your Brother for the Minister of Christ Jesus? your Overseer and Pastor? Will ye not maintain and comfort him*—against all such as wickedly would rebell against God and his Holy Ordinance. And that Petition, *Send unto this our Brother, whom, in thy name, we have charged with the chief care of thy Church within the bounds of*

*L. &c.* They can thereby mean no other Office, no other Ordinance of God, and, for kind, no other Charge, than what's giv'n to every particular Pastor. For we find mention'd the *chief* (*d*) of the Apostles in Labour *viz.* and Care, who yet were all equal. Neither is it strange that they thus set apart him who was, for the time, found needfull in these dark times and places, to plant and erect Churches, preach perpetually where there were none, and in a word, in several things compleatly to imitate the ancient Evangelist. Thus *Paul* and *Barnabas* were separated with a solemnity of Fasting, Prayer and Imposition of Hands (*e*) And yet the Work or Office for which they were separated, was neither new nor perpetual.

§. 17. Having overthrown the Reasons of his Gloss, it must yeeld to the Text, expressly telling us, they were erected only for that time, and that for the paucity of Ministers endowed with singular Graces. *But this reason* (says he) *is nought.* For suppose we 20, 30, 40 Men in the Kingdom qualify'd for the Office of the Ministry; could not these have araided the Kingdom into a proportionable number of large Parishes? And, Still, as more Men turn'd qualify'd, could they not have lessen'd these greater Parishes? But he with whom our Reformers (*f*) were all most contemptible Idiots, and more especially in Church-policy, needs not wonder tho' they had fall'n into a much greater Solecism. But he forgets, that many in these most dark times were made Ministers, who yet needed the Assistance and Direction of the better qualify'd for a while in Church-policy, and matters of such importance, till they should be able to go hand in hand with them, and that the main end of Superintendents was the perpetual Travelling, Preaching and Instru'cting where there were no Pastors and planting of Churches. As well (continues he) as our Presbyterian Brethren now unite Presbyteries. A strange mistake, as if, where Presbyteries are united, any Minister took for his proper Charge a multitude of Parishes. He here insinuates, that in the Superintendents there was established a Prelacy: But the present Question is only about the sentiments of our Reformers: and that they never thought the use of Superintendents crossed the Doctrine of Parity, is most clear, were there no more, from their using Superintendent-commissioners, even after they had declar'd Episcopacy unlawfull in it self. But all this their jangle is the fruit of meer pre-

(*d*) 2 Cor. 11. 5. (*e*) Acts 13. 3. compared with 14. 26. [*f*] See his Pages 242. & sequentes.

judice

judice or worse, for none near these times look'd on Superintendency as perpetual. Not the Court Party, seeing they endeavour'd to change Superintendents for Tulchan Bishops: not the rest of the Church, who, as the necessity of them decreased, suffer'd them to wear out. And after that, in an unanimous Assembly, they had ordain'd that the whole Church should be divided in a competent number of Presbyteries, declar'd that Superintendents were no longer expedient. And good ground had they, even from that very Book of Policy so to do: for, if the whole tenor of that Head of Superintendents, appointing them almost constantly to Travel, to Preach thrice a week at least, and beside that to examine the Life &c. of the Ministers, the Orders of the Kirks, the manners of the People, care how the Poor be provided, how the Youth be instructed, admonish, where it's needfull, by good Counsel, compose Differences, note and delate to the Kirk hainous Crimes, and all this, because of the paucity of qualific'd Ministers; evidently proclaims not, that this Superintendent was a kind of Evangelist, expedient only at that juncture of the re-entry of the Gospel into Scotland, I appeal to the candid Judgement of the impartial.

Moreover, if 'twere otherwise, why should they not as punctually have described his Duties after the time of his perpetual Travels, his Preaching thrice a week, and other such vast Labours were ended (for he grants these were to indure but for a time) after which he insinuates, that the Superintendents were to remain quiet in their chief Towns, but no word in all the account we have of them of such distinctions of times, of such perpetual rest, not a word therefore of their perpetuity.

Lastly; which he wisely, *i. e.* *sutably to his purpose*, omitted, for, like the Council ask'd at Abel, *it ends the matter*; see this Head of Superintendents. *Because (say they) we have appointed a larger Stipend to them that shall be Superintendents, than to the rest of the Ministers, we have thought good to signify to your Honours such Reasons as moved us to make difference betwixt Preachers at this time.* Now, pray, may not he that runs, read here that, had it not been for some forcing Circumstances and Exigencies of the then present time, they had made no difference at all between one Minister and another. And then after a few lines they laid down their Reasons in the very words, the sense whereof is now under Debate; *If the Ministers &c.*

§. 18. In the mean while, we need not be much concern'd whether



these *Superintendents* were to be temporary or perpetual, there being nothing therein that made any real difference between the Church-government which was then, and that which is now. And indeed, these vast Travels and Pains in preaching thrice a week &c, are sure enough Tokens that the *Superintendent* could not be much distinguish'd from an ordinary Pastor, save in these extraordinary Labours, and was far from the Episcopal Eminency, and Grandour, seeing he was so far from the Episcopal ease and idleness, without which the former but rarely obtains.

This, and other such Proofs of the vast difference between the *Superintendents* and their *Diocesans*, and of the likeness between the Government under the Reformers and that which is now, our Author slides over with rally saying, it may be as well told them, that *Bishops wore black Hats and silk*, *Superintendents blew Bonnets and tartan*; as if most constant and hard labour in the Gospel, were no more valuable for distinguishing one Minister from another, than highland Plydes and blew Bonnets. He meets you with the like Drollery, if you mind him, that the *Superintendents* had no Metropolitane and Episcopal Consecration or Ordination, but it's *visus sardonius*. And his Questions, (*What is this to Parity or Imparity amongst the Governours of the Church? Do these differences distinguish between Bishops and Superintendents as to preeminence of Power?*) flow from deep dissimulation of the mortal Wound giv'n to his Cause, seeing without Episcopal Ordination, which was never requir'd to a *Superintendent* (For *Knox*, as for example, who with our Author was only a *Presbyter*, ordain'd or admitted, as they then spoke, *Spotswood Superintendent*) there can be no Episcopal Power, no, not so much as the very essentials of a Bishop. These *Superintendents* were also without any Civil Places, power or emoluments that way, which make up the far greater part of the Episcopal greatness, and still subject and accountable to the General Assemblies.

And there was reason for it (saith our Author) supposing that General Assemblies as then constituted, were sit to be supreme Judicatories of the National Church, For there was no reason that *Superintendents* should have been Popes. Then surely either were our Prelats, Popes, or most vehemently coveted a papal Power, seeing above all things they fear'd, abhorr'd and studi'd the ruine of these our General Assemblies. And no wonder if they did so, and that our Author intimats his dislike of these our Assemblies. For if this one thing, viz. the subjection of the *Superintendents* to these Assemblies



Assemblies, as they were then constituted, be duely weigh'd, it's fair to set them on the very same levell with their Brethren. For, give him never so great a Power in the Province where he superintended, and let him use it as he pleased, yet neither can the Imparity be counted considerable, nor the harm he could do very hurtfull, for within half a year at most (for there was a General Assembly twice, at least, every year) they had a prospect of a General Assembly to right their wrong, wherein every Pastor was to have no less Power than any Superintendent, and no less capable to sit judge and censure the Superintendent, than the Superintendent was on the other hand, to exerce the like Power over him; yea, any Minister in the Assembly, & such sometimes as were none, was as fair to be chosen Moderator as any Superintendent. By the frequency of these Assemblies, it came to pass, that few or no matters of importance were determin'd in the inferiour Synods, but came thither for their final Decision. Wherefore, if we narrowly look on these times, we shall find that the Superintendents were rather appointed as Observers and Delators of Matters to the Assembly, than any proper Judges thereof, save when a special command was giv'n him to cognosce on such and such particular Matters. He was frequently also charged with execution of the Assemblies Determinations, all which was common to him with other Commissioners to whom the Assembly gave the like Charge, and sent them not rarely to these very Provinces where there were Superintendents with equal Power and Authority to that of the Superintendent. Sometimes they ordain'd Causes to be handled by the Superintendent with the assistance of these Commissioners, sometimes by the Commissioner with the assistance of the Superintendents, which Commissioners were sometimes Ministers of another Province, and sometimes of that Province wherein was the Superintendent, with whom they were join'd with equal Power & Authority. From all which 'tis evident, how much they are taken with the humor of cavilling, who dare to ascribe to the Superintendents any real Superiority or Power over other Pastors, or any thing repugnant to a compleat Parity.

But there is yet more: even in his own Synod, he could do nothing contrary to the Majority, for he was to act nothing without the Synods Consent, neither could he impede ought done by the Majority, for he had no negative vote. (g) Yea, he was made subject to the Tryal and

[g] See 1. Book of Discipline. Head 3. Of the Election of Superintendents.

80 *The Fundamentals of the Hierarchy* Part I.  
Censures of the Synod of the very province where he superintended. And here our Author is compell'd to acknowledge that there was a considerable difference between Superintendents and Bishops: and indeed 'twas considerable with a witness, and so considerable that it really sets them on even ground with each Pastor of the word. He adds, *that this was a great wrong, and error in the Constitution*; and on this occasion has a long invective (b) against our Reformers, & in speciall *Knox*, counting them Children, Idiots, Ungovernable, and of bad Principles, and spares not to flegg at all Scots men or Scotch mettall, as he speaks. But this is but a kicking against the pricks. He knows all this helps him nothing, nor is to the present Question, which is not *de jure* but *de facto*, what our Reformers freely and joyntly did? Not, on what grounds they did so?

He next retorts, *that according to the book of Discipline, the Elders are allow'd to admonish, correct, and, with the consent of the Church and Superintendent, depose their Minister*. But, First, tho our Reformers had spoken just alike of the Elders and Ministers as they did of the Synod and Superintendent, their words will not bear the like inference: the power they give to the Elders could certainly be a spurr to the Ministers, and yet they might be sure the few Elders of one parish would never make so bold with their Minister, as the whole Synod might with their Superintendent.

Secondly, There is no such allowance giv'n to the Elders concerning their Minister as to the Synod over their Superintendent: the former must act only with the consent of the Kirk and Superintendent, but nothing of this injoyn'd to the latter. Yea our Author himself will have the power of Deposition to be a prerogative of the Superintendent, and no doubt he or the Commissioner did, in the Churches name, execute her sentence. To Depose therefore here, and that with allowance of the whole context of that 8 head of Discipline, which he cites, is nothing else than to delate to the Church, and Superintendent the crimes of the Minister, and in their own sphere assist them in that action. He adds, *he hath no where found that de facto the Superintendent was judged by his own Synod*. And it may be so: for little do we find of any thing was then done by provincial synods, every thing of moment being left to the General Assemblies, which were then most frequent. Such a Constitution (adds he) inferrs no such thing as Parity among Church-Officers

Se<sup>c</sup>t. 8. *examin'd and disprov'd.*

81

*Those who maintain that the King is inferior to his Subjects in their Collection, are not yet so extravagant as to say, he is not Superior to every one of them in their Distribution.* But where Superiours or Equalls can be gotten, the Men of this Principle will freely yeeld, that none, who are Inferiours in the Distribution ought to judge the Actions of their Superiours, providing other Judges can be had, who, in this Case can't, there being but one King only in a Kingdom: Hence they, believing that none may live lawless, think the King's Actions are cognoscible by these who are his Inferiours, but altering their capacity in the Collection. But is it so in the Case of the Superintendent, whereof there were severals, & not one only, as there is one commonly King in a Kingdom? Seeing then he was to be judged by the Synod, notwithstanding, that there were other Superintendents in the Church; 'tis evident, they counted every Brother in the Ministry his equal.

§. 19. *But the Superintendents ( i ) had a stock of prerogatives above other Pastors.* But be it so: yet notwithstanding hereof, if we suppose, which I trust at the narrowest search shall appear, the truth of what we have now adduc'd, and the self consistency of the actions of our Reformers, whom he would fain set at variance with themselves, whatsoever Prerogatives he has really brought, can never prove that the Superintendent had any Dominion over other Pastors, or that they acted not in a true and real Parity; so that, from what is now said, these his pretended Disparities are prevented and remov'd. For example, he tells us, ' that Superintendents had a larger district, were nominated by the Council, elected by the Nobility and Gentry; 'twas 'not so with the Paroch Ministers. But the Commissioners had no less districts, and were appointed by the General Assembly, which I'm sure is of no less weight in the case than the Councils Nomination, even tho' the Gentlemens Election be added thereto, and yet, who in his Wit will take him for any other Officer than is every Parish-minister, or fall in to the rovery of our Author, who ( k ) calls these Commissioners *temporary Bishops*.

*Paroch-ministers, by the first Book of Discipline head 8, were deposable by the Superintendent, and the Elders of their Parishes. The Superintendent was to be judged by the Ministers and Elders of the whole Province.* But the fraud is palpable, the words of the Book of Discipline are, *that if a Mi-*

( i ) Page 120. ( k ) Page 37.

M

nister

nister be worthy of Deposition, the Elders of his Parish may, with consent of the ~~Rich~~ and Superintendent, depose him. Where you see the Kirk or Minister and Elders of the Province are no less interested in the Deposition of a Minister than in the judging of a Superintendent. He suppress'd therefore all mention of the Kirk, which even Spotswood, whom he cites, (1) expresses: to the end he might make his Reader believe no Minister, save the Superintendent only, had any power in Deposition of Ministers.

But private Ministers (saith he) were to be admitted by their Superintendents, but the Superintendents by the Superintendents next adjacent, and the Superintendents had the Power of Ordination. The first Book of 'Discipline and several Acts of the Assemblies. But, had only the Superintendents the Power of Ordination? yea, not only was there no plurality of Superintendents present at the Action, but also John Knox, who was no Superintendent, ordain'd or admitted Spotswood Superintendent of L. yea, every particular Minister, when commissioned by the Assembly, had no less Power of Ordination or any other thing whatsoever, than is either in the Book of Discipline or any where else giv'n to the Superintendent. Neither might any one particular Minister while he was a Commissioner, more than the Superintendent, be translated from one district to another without the Counsel of the whole Church or Assembly; neither were there meaner Qualifications requisite in any Commissioner. And I think Knox, who was never a Superintendent, was in these not inferior to any of 'em.

But he had a living five times so much as another Minister. But then I'm sure, he had five times as much to do with it, being perpetually to Travell, Preach and Exhort far and wide &c: but, if this Rule had been keep'd, our Bishops had got five times less than any other Minister, for rarely did they any such Duty, either at home or abroad. In the mean while, The Power of Riches, and the baseness of Poverty, makeith not a Bishop either higher or lower. (m)

But Superintendents (saith he) were constant Members of General Assemblies, had Power to Visit, and to try the like &c. of the Ministers of all the Churches of the Diocese, and were to try those who stood Candidates for the Ministry, had Power of granting Collations on Presentations. But, whatsoever he had of these, belong'd also to every particular Pastor when commissioned by the General Assembly: but, tho' the Superintendent or Commissioner

Sect. 8. *examin'd and disprov'd.* 83  
 er is only nam'd in such Cases, as in trial of the Candidats, granting Col-  
 lations, Deposition of Ministers &c. He is to be understood as the Mo-  
 derator, and mouth of the Synod where he Superintended, for Exam-  
 ple, the Assembly in the case of transportation, chargeth the Ministers to  
 obey the Voice and Commandment of their Superintendent, and yet by  
 the very same Act, (n) none can be translated without the Consent of the most  
 part of the Elders and Ministers of Kirks conven'd in the Synodal Assembly;  
 and yet from this very Act, he adventres to conclude the Canonical Obe-  
 dience of Pastors to their Superintendents.

But, he had Power to nominate Ministers to be Members of the General  
 Assembly. For, Assembly 1562. 'twas ordain'd, that no Minister leave  
 his Flock for coming to the Assembly, except he have Complaints to make, or  
 be complain'd off, or at least, be warn'd thereto by the Superintendent. And  
 the L. Glamis in a Letter to Mr. Beza, saith, (o) that, after the Refor-  
 mation it fell out by custom, that the Bishops and so many of the Ministers, Pa-  
 stors and Elders as the Bishops appointed----- came to the General Assem-  
 bly. But touching what he alledges as said by the L. Glamis, I can find  
 it no where, save in the Works of Saravia; and Beza's Answer to Gla-  
 mis his second Question, wherein these words are found, neither meets  
 with, nor presupposes any such Clause. But be it that L. Glamis said  
 so, what will they hence infer? he says indeed, that this came to pass af-  
 ter the Reformation, but how long 'twas after the Reformation, before  
 this was practis'd, he says not. 'Twas (saith he) receiv'd by Customs: by  
 no Decree of the Church then, or Acts of the Assembly. And lastly, he  
 speaks of Bishops, not of Superintendents. And I never find that any  
 about these times gave Superintendents the name of Bishops; and so this  
 makes nothing for our Author's purpose. Wherefore, if ever L. Glamis  
 had any such Expression, whereof I much doubt, in my mind, he mean'd  
 it of the Tulchans, who, for some space after the Leith-convention made  
 some steps toward such a Superiority; otherwise, all the accounts we  
 have of these times, and, in special, the Acts of our Assemblies demon-  
 strat, that there was no such Power or Priviledge giv'n to any then in  
 Scotland: yea, so much our Author himself presently proves, and over-

(n) Cald. Ms. Hist. Vol. 1. Page 789. (o) Apud Saraviam exam.  
 tract. de Episcopatum triplici genere. Quest. 2. Pag. 91. Post reformatam Religionem,  
 consuetudine receptum est, ut Episcopi, & ex Ministris, Pastoribus, & Senioribus, tot, quot  
 iidem Episcopi jusserint, unum in locum conveniant &c.

turns this his own Argument by citing another out of the Assembly July 1563, (1568, he should have said) (p) viz. *Anent the Order hereafter to be used in General Assemblies-----They all voted and concluded as followeth, viz. that if the Order already received, pleases not, by reason of the plurality of Voices, it be reformed in this manner.*

*First, that none have place to Vote, except Superintendents, Commissioners appointed for visiting the Kirks, and Ministers brought with them, presented as Persons able to reason, and having knowledge to judge: with the aforesaid shall be joined Commissioners of Burghs and Shires, together with Commissioners of Universities. Secondly. Ministers and Commissioners shall be Chosen at the Synodal-convention of the Diocess, by the Consent of the rest of the Ministers and Gentlemen, that shall convene at the said Synodal-convention &c.*

From this Act 'tis clear, that the former in 1562. has only been mention'd, never concluded; or, at least, cas'd and repeal'd by some intervenient Assembly, otherways, there had been no place or ground for the Act of 1568. which presupposes, that ev'n these, that were not at all thus Chosen at the Synod, were free to come and Vote at the Assembly. So far was this liberty from being put in the Superintendent or Commissioner's Power. And indeed from this Act, 'tis most evident, and 'tis left on Record also, by the *Vindictour of Philadelphus*, that before the time of this Act, all Ministers who pleased, were free to Vote at the Assemblies, & yet, with our Author, *Petrie* must be a mixer of lies for saying so much. But *Calderwood* (saith our Author) leaves out intirely these words, *brought with them, i. e. with the Superintendents and Commissioners of Kirks, presented as Persons able to reason, and having knowledge to judge, whereby the Power of Superintendents and Commissioners for visiting of Kirks is quite stifled, and the whole sense of the Act perverted.* For what sense is it I pray, to say, that the Ministers were Chosen by Consent of the rest of the Ministers, when you tell not who was to choose, or who they were to whose choice or nomination the rest of the Ministers were to give that Consent, But to stifle the Power he pleads for to Superintendents was a Work impossible, either to *Calderwood*, or any man else, the very Act it self most irrefragably shewing, they could have none, save such as is in any meer Moderator of our Synods or Presbyteries. For, be it, which yet the Assembly expresses not, that the Superintendents were to nominate Ministers for the Assembly, yet they could do no more, but only as the Sy-



nod by their Votes assented or choosed the nominated Persons, whom if the Synod or its major part rejected, these could not go to the Assembly, yet some behov'd to go, and consequently the Superintendent or Commissioner was to make a new Lite, and name again; and if these did not yet please, another Lite, and so on, untill the Synod was satisfi'd, and choosed some Persons or other according to their pleasure, for the Assembly. This much is undeniably contain'd in the A&t, and I'm sure, no Moderator of any Synod or Presbytry enjoys any less Power, providing it deserve the name. Seeing then *Brought with them*, cannot possibly mean any peculiar Power, I see not wherein *Calderwood* by omitting them can be culpable. Neither, can he be accused of nonsense, seing 'tis sufficiently intelligible and plain how these Ministers and Commissioners could be chosen by the consent of the rest of his Brethren, the Ministers and Gentle-men, members of the Synod, who, by joynt and mutual consent, chused them after the Superintendent or Commissioners nominating or liting, which, by a fraud too palpable, he confounds with *Election*. And here it's observable in how much torment and perplexity this so clear an A&t involves all of 'em. *Spotswood*, adduc'd it in his latine Pamphlet, but is so soundly chastis'd by the *Vindicator of Philadelphia*, that our Author finds not a syllable to say in his defence. He pretends also to relate it in his History (q), but with an essential Depravation, for he leaves out these words, *Ministers and Commissioners of Shires shall be chosen at the Synodal Convention of the Diocy, with consent of the rest of the Ministers and Gentlemen that shall convene at the said Synodal Convention*. For, he saw it quite spoil'd his Cause, and really left the Superintendent no Power, but what was equally in any of the rest, and foists into the Text these *such Ministers as the Superintendents should chuse in their Diocesan Synods*. Neither can our Author be blameless in suppressing the following words. *Commissioners of Burghs shall be appointed by the Council and Kirk of their own Towns, none shall be admitted without sufficient Commission in write. And least this should turn to perpetual Election of a few and certain Persons, it is concluded, Ministers and other Commissioners be changed from Assembly to Assembly*. Whereby appears the Churches great care, that neither Superintendent nor any other might have ought like an Episcopal Power, and that all fit Persons might have equal priviledge of Voting at the Assemblies. There yet



remain many of his pretended Disparities, but, are no more significative of eminency or superiour Office, no less communicable to the rest of the Ministers when Commissioners than were the former, as will be evident to any, who reads the Acts of the Assemblies, among which, he reckons the Superintendent's modifying to Ministers their Stipends, as if, because Judas had the Baggs, and bare what was put therein, he had been Bishop over the rest of the Apostles. In the mean while, the Superintendents could do nothing of this, but only as Moderator of the provincial Synod.

Another Deduction of no better metall is, (r) *that the Laird of Dun, Superintendent of Angus.* not as such, but by vertue of a particular Commission giv'n by the Assembly to him and others join'd with him, depos'd a Regent of *Aberdeen*, a place intirely without the bounds of his Superintendency; therefore Superintendents as such, had a Power *Paramount* and Episcopal. And was not such an arguer a man of sense? I pass the rest of his thirty Disparities not without admiration, that such a fertile brain could not invent one other, for one and thirty used to carry the Game.

Add to all this, that tho' some that had been Popish Bishops in *Scotland* and imbrac'd the Gospel, as Mr. *Gordon of Galloway* a man of no contemptible Gifts, were by our Reformers allow'd, without any new Admission, to dispence the Word and Sacraments; yet, they were never allow'd to exercise what they counted their Episcopal Function, or look'd on as Bishops of these Diocesess: yea Mr. *Gordon*, tho' he earnestly sought for it, could never be admitted to Superintend in *Galloway*, which is a clear Demonstration, that our Reformers looked on the Episcopal preheminance as a meer Popish Corruption, otherways, why did not Mr. *Gordon*, *verbi causa*, remain in the Power and Character he had enjoyed while Romanist.

It's most clear also from all the accounts we have of the *Tulchan Bishops*, that all men of all parties look'd on a Bishop, as a thing altogether diverse from a Superintendent.

§. 20. And now at length hear him yeelding the whole Plea, (f) *There was (saith he) a Principle had, then, got too much footing among some Protestant Divines, viz. That the best way to reform a Church, was, to recede as far from the Papists as they could; to have nothing in common with them, but the essentials; the necessary and indispensable Articles and Parts of Christian*

*Religion; whatever was, in its Nature indifferent, and not positively and expressly commanded in the Scriptures, if it was in fashion in the Popish Churches, was therefore to be laid aside, and avoided as a Corruption; as having been abused, and made subservient to Superstition and Idolatry.*

*This Principle John Knox was fond of, and maintain'd zealously; and the rest of our reforming Preachers were much acted by his influences. In pursuance of this Principle, therefore, when they compil'd the first Book of Discipline, they would not Reform the old Polity, and purge it of such Corruptions as had crept into it, keeping still by the main draughts and lineaments of it;-----But they laid it quite aside, and in stead thereof hammer'd out a new Scheme, keeping at as great a distance from the old one, as they could, and as the essentials of Polity would allow them; establishing no such thing, however, as Parity, as I have fully proven. And no wonder; for as Imparity has, obviously, more of Order, beauty and usefulness in its aspect, so it had never so much as by dreaming, enter'd their thoughts, that it was a limb of Antichrist, or a reliet of Popery.*

*But was not Episcopacy in fashion in the Popish Churches? And, dare he, yea or any mortal say, that ever our Reformers believed it to be an indispensible part of the Christian Religion positively and expressly commanded in the Scriptures: Do not therefore his saying establishing however no such thing as Parity &c and the rest of his Discourse mutually give the lie, and flee in the face of one another. And indeed, he here at once overthrows whatsoever he said on this Subject: and now for ever to silence all reasonable men, and stop them from such desperat adventures as this of our Authors, take the following Argument.*

*Whatsoever our Reformers believed to be without the express and positive Testimony of the Scriptures, that they believed to be a damnable Corruption in Religion, and as such to be avoided.*

*This the major is put beyond scruple, by what we have brought from the first Book of Discipline, Knox, and the Confessions of our Author: Now I subjoin.*

*But they believed, that Episcopacy was altogether without any express or positive Testimony, yea, or any Warrant or Ground from the Word of God, the Books of the Old and New Testament; Ergo &c. The minor is no less evident from what is already adduc'd: and moreover, from the latter Helvetian Confession, which was all (save the allowance of the remembrance of some Holy Days, which they expressly disprov'd) approv'd and subscribed by our whole General Assembly at*

*Edinburgh,*

*Edinburgh, December 25. 1566.* (t) For, in that Confession (mark it, pray, carefully, and by no means forget, that our Church and Reformers, who approv'd and subscrib'd this Confession, firmly believ'd that, whatsoever is without the express Commandment of God's Word, is damnable to Man's Salvation.) they say (u) There's giv'n to all Ministers in the Church, one and the same Power or Function: And indeed, in the beginning, Bishops and Presbyters ruled the Church in common, none preferri'd himself to another, or usurped any more honourable Power or Dominion to himself over his fellow Bishops. But according to the words of the Lord, who will be first among you, let him be your Servant, they persevered in Humility, and helped one another by their mutual Duties, in Defending and Governing the Church. In the meantime for preserving Order, some one of the Ministers, did call the Assembly, and proposed these things that were to be consulted in the Meeting; He did also receive the Opinions of others; and finally, according to his Power, he took care that no confusion should arise, so S. Peter is said to have done in the Acts of the Apostles, who notwithstanding was never set over the rest, nor indu'd with greater power and honour, but the beginning took its rise from Unity, that the Church might be declared to be one. And having related Hierome's Doctrine of the Identity of Bishop & Presbyter thus they conclude. Therefore none may lawfully hinder to return to the ancient Constitution of the Church of God, and embrace it before human Custom.

Thus far the Authors of that most famous Confession, who both in the Title page, and after the Preface expressly assert, that our Church of Scotland together with the Churches of Poland, Hungary, Geneva, Neocomo, Myllhusium, and Wiend approved and subscribed this their Confession.

From all which it's easie to gather and perceive, with how black a <sup>Ⓐ</sup> our first Reformers and whole primitive Church Protestant branded Prelacy or Imparity amongst Pastors.

(t) *Cald. Ms. Hist. Vol. 2. Page 24.* (u) *Fol. 52. Data est autem omnibus in Ecclesia Ministris una & æqualis potestas sive functio. Certè ab initio, Episcopi vel Presbyteri Ecclesiam communi opera gubernaverunt: nullus alteri se prætulit— Sic legitur fecisse in Actis Apostolorum S. Petrus, qui tamen ideo nec aliis fuit præpositus, nec potestate majore ceteris præditus. Ideoque nemo jure prohibuerit ad veterem Ecclesiam Dei constitutionem redire, & illam præ humana consuetudine recipere.*

## Section IX.

*The Forraign reform'd Churches truly 'Presbyterian.*

**B**UT let's hear the Judgement of the rest of the Reformers, and Reform'd transmarine Churches. *Gerard*, a famous *Lutheran* divine, (a) altho', for Orders sake, he admit of some kind of Episcopacy, which really he makes as good as nothing above a Moderator-ship, yet even for that umbrage allows nothing but humane Institution, and will acknowledge no distinction by Divine Right between Bishop and Presbyter. The *Papists* (saith he (b)) especially place that superior Power of Jurisdiction which they make to agree to Bishops in this, that the Bishops can Ordain Ministers but the Presbyters cannot. And all along this Question he strongly proves that, during the Apostolick age there was no such thing as a distinction between a Bishop and a preaching Presbyter: and enervats all the Arguments that both Romanists and other Prelatists commonly bring to the contrary. But, we need not insist on the Testimonies of particular Men: we have the joint suffrages of the body of *Lutheran* Divines, *Luther* himself being the mouth to the rest, in the Articles of *Smalcald* (c). It's clear (say they) even from the Confession of our Adversaries, that this Power, to wit of preaching, dispensing the Sacraments, Excommunication and Absolution, is common to all that are set over the Churches, whither they be called Pastors, Presbyters or Bishops: Wherefore *Hierome* plainly affirms, that there is no difference between Bishop and Presbyter, but that every Pastor was a Bishop.-----Here *Hierome* teaches, that the distinction of degrees between a Bishop and a Presbyter or Pastor, was only appointed by humane Au-

(a) *Loc. cit.* Tom. 6. Col. 260. (b) Col. 261. Atqui superiorem illam jurisdictionis potestatem jure Divino Episcopis competentem Pontificii in eo vel maxime ponunt, quod Episcopus possit ordinare Ministros, Presbyteri vero minime, &c. (c) Apud *Osiandrum*. Epitom. Hist. Eccles. parte 1. Page 299. Art. *Smalcald*. de Episcoporum jurisdictione. Liquet autem confessione omnium, etiam Adversariorum nostrorum, hanc potestatem (Evangelium docendi viz. peccata remittendi &c.) communem esse omnibus.--- Hic docet *Hieronymus*, distinctos gradus Episcoporum &c. tantum humana auctoritate constitutos esse----- quia autem jure Divino nullum est discrimen inter Episcopum &c.

N

thority.

thority. And the matter is self ( continues Luther and his Associates ) declares no less, for, on both Bishop and Presbyter is laid the same Duty and the same Injunction. And only Ordination in after times made the difference between Bishop and Pastor. ----- And by Divine Right there is no difference between Bishop and Pastor.

§ 2. As for Calvin, his judgement in this matter was altogether conform to his practice, which by the very Adversaries themselves is made the very Patern of Presbytry, for he ( d ) asserts the Identity of Bishop, Presbyter, Pastor, and Minister: and this Identity of Bishop and Presbyter, he founds on Titus 1. and 5. compared with the 7, as Hierome had done long before him, and Presbyterians do now. And when he descends to after times succeeding these of the Apostles, he tells us, ( e ) that then the Bishop had no Dominion over his Collegues sc. the Presbyters, but was among them, what the Consul was in the Senat, and his Office was to propose Matters, enquire the Votes, preside in Admonition, and moderate the Action, and put in Execution what was decreed by the whole Consistory: All which exceeded little or nothing the Office of a Moderator. And that even this ( saith he ) was introduced through the necessity of the time by humane consent is acknowledged by the Ancients themselves. But I shall not insist in citing Calvine nor Beza, who, every where is full sufficiently to our purpose, both of'em being abundantly vindicated, and evinc'd to be Presbyterian in a singular tractat by the most judicious Author of *Reclinas Instruendum*, from the attempts of one who pretended to be *Mathematico-Theologus*, but was in reality *Sophistico-Micrologus*. And were there any doubt concerning these, as indeed there's none, their Practice and that of the Church wherein they liv'd, our very Adversaries being Judges, sufficiently discuss it, and prove them to be truly Presbyterian: and to them subscribes the stream of transmarine Writers, Systematicks, Controvertists, and Commentators. As for Example, the famous and learn'd *Musculus* ( f ) asserts and proves from *Acts* 20. *Philip*. 1. and the like Texts, which we now use, that Bishop, Pastor and Presbyter are all one

( d ) Instit. 4. Cap. 3. Sect. 8. & alibi. ( e ) Cap. 4. Neque tamen sic honore & dignitate superiorem erat Episcopus ut dominium in collegas haberet sed quas partes habet Consul in Senatu — Atque id ipsum pro temporum necessitate fuisse humano consensu inductum fatentur ipsi veteres. ( f ) Loc. Com. Page 246. Tertio eisdem esse Presbyteros quosque & Episcopos & Pastores, ex eo patet quod *Act*. 20. legimus ad hunc modum &c. — unde videas Apostolorum tempore in Ecclesia Christi eisdem fuisse Presbyteros, Pastores & Episcopos.

1  
2

and

Sect. 9. *examin'd and disprov'd.* 91  
*and the same, and that in one Church there were at one time conjunctly many Bishops.* Of the same mind are all the Systematick Divines, yea even Tilen himself while Orthodox. *We judge (saith he (g)) not only with Hierome, but also with Lombard, Gratian, Card. Cusan and others, that the preferring one out of the Colledge of Pastors to the rest, and giving him the name of Bishop was a humane Invention.* This Author indeed alter'd his mind concerning Church Government when he pelagianiz'd, for then he turns altogether (tho' to his cost) a Hectore of the Zelots of the Genevan Discipline. Time would fail me in collecting Testimonies of this kind, seeing, there were ever few, I may say none, save a small handful in Britain, who have not asserted that, during the Apostolick age, there was no such thing, as any distinction between Bishop and Pastor or preaching Presbyter: and that among these there was an intire equality.

To these we may add the Testimonies of the most and famous of the reformed Churches in their Confessions, whereof we have seen not a few already, while we related the Testimony of the Helvetian Confession, together with the approbations thereof: no less illustrious and pregnant is the Testimony of the French Confession: *We believe (say they (h)) that all true Pastors where ever they be, are endu'd with equal and the same power, under that one Head Christ the Chief and Universal Bishop.* To the same purpose also speaks the Dutch Confession: *We believe (say they (i)) that this true Church ought to be governed by that spiritual Policy, so that there be in it Pastors or Ministers that may purely dispense the Word and Sacraments, that there be also Elders and Deacons &c.*

§. 3. The harmonious and Catholick Testimony of all the reformed Churches are to some like pricks in their eyes, and thorns in their sides, and therefore, most various and heterogeneous means are used to render it unserviceable. And amongst other things, we are told, that many forraign Divines and Churches have a great likeing for their Diocesan Way, and Zanchius (say they (k)) counts all its Opposers Schismatics.

(g) Syntag. part. alt. Page 544. *Quod ex horum Pastorum seu Presbyterorum collegio, unus reliquis esset praepositus & Episcopi cognomento ornatus singulariter ab humano ortu instituto, nona divino praecepto, existimamus, non solum cum Hieronymo verum etiam cum Lombardo, Gratiano, Card. Cusano & aliis.* (h) Art. 30. *Credimus omnes veros Pastores ubicunque locorum collocati fuerint eadem & aequali inter se potestate esse praeditos.* (i) *Credimus veram hanc Ecclesiam debere regi &c.* (k) Prideaux apud Maresum exam. prim. 4. Questionum Theolog. Pag. 63, pro Calvinistis &c.



But *Maresius* answers (l) that *Zanchius* never allow'd of a Lord-Bishop, but only of such a one who is like a Rector of a Colledge, whose Power I'm sure, is little or nothing above that of a Moderator. *Maresius* adds (m) that he can find in no place of *Zanchius*, the words *Prideaux* had alledg'd. And lastly, as *Maresius* tells us (n), *Zanchius* professes that he cannot but love the zeal of such as hate the names of Bishop and Arch-Bishop, fearing least with these Names the ancient Ambition and Tyranny together with the destruction of the Churches should return. *Prideaux* also alledges that *Calvin* writing to the King of Poland, advises him to establish Bishops and Arch-bishops. But has the same return from *Maresius* (o), viz. that this is the Bishop's own Dream, and that there is no such thing to be found in *Calvin*. This dealing is not very laudable.

Neither are Means wanting to procure Advocats from Abroad; one (p) whereof brings many things either to defend or excuse the Hierarchy, and to shew that it's not ill link'd abroad, and amongst other things saith, (q) that notwithstanding of what is in the *Helvetian Confession*, us Authors condemn not the Liberty of other Churches as they manifest in their Preface, protesting, that in all this Confession they agreed with the Church of England. But this Author can't be ignorant, that seeing, according to that Confession, Christ gave equal Power to all Pastors, and according to what is alledg'd to be the Judgement of the present Church of England, he did the quite contrary. Their Preface can by no means prove, that they allow of the Sentiments and Practice of the present English Church, except he would have the Preface to contradict the Confession. But all this he says is only to darken an evident Truth; the meaning of the Preface being, that between the *Helvetians* and the *English* there was no such fundamental Difference as prohibited mutual Charity one to another which many have given, and may give to these, who, as they judge, retain'd many Errors, tho' not Fundamental. The same Author, (r) objects, that many Churches, and amongst others, that of the *Helvetians*, have either Bishops over their Pastors, or, which is really the same, Superintendents. But to instance in the *Helvetians*, they in their Confession saying that, Christ gave a like Power to all Pastors &c.

(l) Page 66. *Quamquam non ut dominus &c.* (m) Page 65. *Nullum novi Zanchii tractatum de &c.* (n) Page 66. *Profitetur se non posse nostrorum zelum non amare qui ideo illa nomina (Episcoporum & Archi-episcoporum) oderunt &c.* (o) Page 67. *Nec Calvinus ut somniat doctissimus Episcop. &c.* (p) *Spanhemius F. contra Vander Waeyen.* (q) *Parte speciali.* Page 149. (r) Pages 129, 130, 131, 132, & alibi.

and therefrom concluding, *that none may hinder to return to Christ's primitive Institution*, make most apparent that they intended no continuation of any Superiority amongst Pastors, and consequently of no Bishops, or, their equivalent, Superintendents: but all this work he makes, *is dictis gratis* for the fashion only: for if in *Helvetia* or else where, there be any umbrage of Bishops or Superintendents, it's really an Obtrusion and *Erastian* Usurpation; and this we may learn from himself, freely acknowledging, (f) *that the chief legislative Power in the Church matters, is in the hands of the supream Magistrat.* Otherways he confesses, *that* (t) *the choicest of Writers, and amongst others, Hoornebeck, make the Discipline of the Scots, French, Dutch, and Helvetian Churches to be one and the same.* Moreover, he sufficiently answers himself while, (u) he expressly grants, *that between the Superintendents or Bishops through Germany, and these of England, there is an infinit difference, and that these in Germany have only a simple prerogative of Order, but not at all of any Jurisdiction, or any thing that can be properly term'd Power.* Thus he. And I'm sure, that any *P'ases* of an Assembly hath no less Superiority than he here ascribes to these transmarine Superintendents or Bishops: and indeed, shortly to give an account of this Author, besides, as we have now seen, he is oblig'd to pull back with the one hand, what he had bestow'd on the Hierarchicks with the other; his whole Discourse leans upon this Supposition, that there is no certain Form of Church Government left by Christ in his Word: on this depend his Glosses upon the passages we produced of the *French* and *Dutch* Confessions. *Vide inter alia part. spec. a pag. 171 ad pag. 189*, where he all along presupposes and inculcates, that, *tho' according to the Authors of the Confessions, Christ gave equal Power, &c. to all Pastors, yet in their Judgement if the Church will, she may alter this kind of Government, and change that Equality which Christ gave for an Inequality, and give some Pastors a Power over the rest.* Which, if it be not a Contradiction to these Confessions, in stead of an Explication, it looks as like it is one Crow can be like another. For, who can believe, but that if the Authors of these Confessions had believ'd an indifferency of Equality or Inequality of Pastors, they had either intimated so much,

(f) *Nomothesia istic Ecclesiastica penes supream Magistratum.* (t) *Pag. 131, 132. Haud me equidem fugit &c.* (u) *Page 130. Sed ut quod est dicam longissimo inter utroque discrimine. Priorem siquidem mera est ordinis & honoris, nulla jurisdictionis vel potestatis proprie dicta, prerogativa.*

or been altogether silent thereof, neither of which they did, but gave to the World solemnly as the Confession of their Belief, *that Christ gave to all Pastors equal and the same power*: and yet, if we believe this Interpreter, this that Christ gave may, according to the Authors of that Confession be relinquish'd when Men will, and Inequality, it's quite contrary introduced in the place thereof. Is not this too like the dealing of the Romanists, who, when they are compell'd to acknowledge that the Apostles gave the Cup to the People, yet pretend that they may deprive them of what Christ and his Apostles gave them? Divers indeed have said, that Church Government was among the *Adiaphora*, and things indifferent. But these were more wary then to say (as he would have the Authors of these Confessions to say) that Christ gave equal, and the same Power to all Pastors, yea, such used not to grant that Christ gave either Equality or Inequality of Power, but left all to the Churches management.

Moreover, as he does us no dammage, so, I'm sure, he does the present Hierarchicks as little service; for, if this Hypothesis, *that no kind of Church Government is juris divini*, stand, then the *jus divinum* of Episcopacy is lost, and therefore I'm sure, they shall give him as little thanks as we. 'Tis also observable, that when ever the Authors of these Confessions, or other Divines of their Perswasion said, that Communion with Churches of a different Government was not to be broken, or any thing of that kind; he presently inferrs that they judg'd any other form no less agreeable to the word of God than their own.

And here I can't but take notice of what I have met with somewhere in *M. Claude's historical defence of the Reformation* (for, at present, I have not the book) *viz.* that Diocesan Episcopacy is no less condemnable than Pilgrimages, Purgatories, or some such Romish dotages which he there names, and how averse he was from Diocesan Episcopacy, is observed by the Prefacer to the English Translation: and yet, if we believe some, he gave large Testimonies of his great affection to the Diocesan cause.

And this brings to mind another Artifice; for when any Protestant Divines, considering the great Power of Popish Bishops, and vehemently desiring Peace for the free Preaching and Propagation of the Gospel, strain'd their Judgement, and seem'd at any time to do or say somewhat that appear'd to comply with Episcopacy, our Prelatists anone

Infer

Infer, that such Divines were great Lovers of their Hierarchy. Thus, for Example, they abuse the Words and Actions of *Melancton*; but they should remember that sometimes, driving the same Design, some of these Divines seem'd no less to comply with the Papacy it self, as appear'd at the pressing of the *Interim*. The same end drove *Melancton*, when, in a Conference at *Ausburg*, as *Osiander* relates (x), he seem'd to yield somewhat of Jurisdiction to Bishops; for he hop'd that, if Jurisdiction were granted them, they would not so much oppose the Gospel. But *Philip* consider'd not, (continues *Osiander*) that the Fox may change his hair, not his Temper. *Melancton* (y) granted also to the Pope, provided he would admit the Gospel, a superiority over other Bishops, founded only on humane right, and yeelded for procuring of the Peace of Christendom. Thus *Melancton*, through his extream desire of Peace, forc'd his own Judgement, for, with *Luther* and the rest, he subscribes the *Smalkaldick Articles*, wherein, as we have heard, the Scriptural Identity of Bishop and Presbyterian is most clearly asserted.

But, what ever they say to perswade us, that these or other such Divines favour them, we are little oblig'd to believe it, for they believe it not themselves: and these of our Adversaries that speak out their mind freely, tell us, that all the transmarine reformed Churches are really Presbyterian: It were too much I'm sure, to transcribe what *D. Heylin* says of this, for he freely grants it, and then through a whole large Folio, as such bespatters with the blackest of Railings and Calumnies, every one of the reformed Churches in particular.

No less positive is *Howell*, (z) who makes *Calvin* the first Broacher of the Presbyterian Religion, And a little after, Thus (saith he) *Geneva Lake* swallowed up the Episcopal See, and Church Lands were made secular, which was the white they levell'd at. This *Geneva Bird* flew thence to France and hatch'd the Huguenots, which make about the tenth part of that People; it took wing also to Bohemia and Germany high and low, as the Palatinate, the land of Hesse, and the confederat Provinces of the States of Holland.

(x) Epitom. Hist. Eccles. Part. 1. Cent. 16. Lib. 2. Cap. 15. *Videtur autem Melancton in causa fuisse, ut Episcopis aliquid Jurisdictionis concederetur: speravit enim, si &c.* (y) *Osiand. Epit. Hist. Eccles. Cent. 16. Part. 1. Lib. 2. Cap. 37. De pontifice autem statuo. Si Evangelium admitteret, posse ei propter Pacem &c.* (z) Fam. Letters. Vol. 3. Page 395.

Yea

Yea Bellarmine (a), being to write against Presbytry, lays down in the entry as undeniable that 'tis the common doctrine of both (Calvinists and Lutherans).

§. 5. To these may be added all such as were valiant for the truths of God, and stoutly oppos'd themselves to Antichrist, before *Luther*, as the *Waldenses* and *Albigenses*, of whom *Alphonfus de Castro* (b) relates, that they deny'd any difference between Bishop and Presbyter, and herein differ'd nothing from *Aërius*. This same may be learn'd from *Thuan* (c), who compares them with the English Non-conformists. So far from truth was *D. M.* when (d) he says, that these only declaim'd against the corrupt Manners of the Church of Rome, but never declaim'd against the subordination of one Priest unto another.

This same doctrine held *Wicklef* and his followers, denying that there is any difference between Bishop and Presbyter (e). The *Waldenses* and *Wicklef* were in this, as in the rest of their Articles, follow'd by *J. Hufs* and his Adherents, who also asserted, that there ought to be no difference between Bishop and Presbyter or among Priests [f]. Yea so Catholic and universall hath this doctrine, of the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter, still been, that it hath all along, by the Romanists, been justly reckon'd a prime doctrine of *Romes* Opposers [g]. Nor shall yow readily find one before *Luther*, for of such I now speak, of Truth's Witnesses who condemn'd not all distinction between Bishop and Presbyter.

§. 6. And even in *England* it self after the Reformation, the famousst Bishops and lights of that Church, as *Hooper*, *Latimer*, and others, could not, without great difficulty and reluctancy, admitt the exercising of the Episcopal Office, the using of their Priestly vestments &c: to be in any sense lawfull: so far were they from believing a Divine Right of Diocesan Episcopacy. But, as *Voëtius* observes (h) the use of it was excus'd rather than defended.

The first, or at least the Standard-bearer among the first, that either in *England*, or any where else in the reform'd World, had the brow to

(a) De Clericis cap. 14. — et nostris temporibus Lutherani & Calvinistæ &c. (b) fol. 102. hunc eundem errorem post multos annos ab Inferis suscitavit Waldenses, dicentes nullum esse inter Sacerdotes discrimen. (c) Hist. part. 1. lib. 5. Quibus respondent, qui hodie in Anglia puriorem doctrinam præse ferunt. (d) pag. 235. (e) *Alphonfus de Castro* fol 102. (f) *Æneas Sylvius de Bohemorum origine et gestis* cap. 53. doctmata sunt — inter Sacerdotes nullum discrimen esse &c. (g) see the history of the Council of Trent pages 595, 605, 605, 607. (h) Polit. Eccles. part. 2. pag. 833.

Sect. 9. *examin'd and disprov'd.*

97

assert its Divine Right, appear'd in the latter part of Queen Elizabeth's Reign: neither was he a Native of Britain, but a Flemming, I mean Hadrian Saravia once a Pastor in the reform'd Netherlands, but, as *Maresius* witnesses (i), reject'd by them, as being an Enemy to both their Church and State. Neither was he better look'd on, as himself acknowledges (k), by the rest of the reform'd Churches abroad. And I think every true Protestant will yeeld that they had reason so to do, seeing he dares make (l) not only Bishops, but also Arch-Bishops, Metropolitans, yea and Patriarchs to be of Divine Right. And over all these he places the Bishop of Rome, as the Supreme in Order and Honour. He contends moreover, that one Man may be lawfully enough both a Bishop and a Civil Magistrat, and exerce one of these Offices by himself, and another by his Substitutes. (m) The vast Rents of Prelates, the external Pomp of Honours, Titles, and train like that of the greatest secular Nobles, agree well enough with the simplicity of a Gospel-Ministry. They may lawfully enough in their Grandeur and multitude of Servants imitat the greatest Earls and Dukes. All this is sufficiently warranted by Christ while he chus'd twelve Apostles, and seventy Disciples. If you tell him that Christ riding to Jerusalem had no train of Servants, no Noble-men attending him, adorn'd with golden Chains, and riding on trapped Horses, he answers, that Christ did so throw the necessity of that time, least he had been suspected as affecting an earthly Kingdom, and that his want of such Splendor, was the fault of Herod and such Princes as knew him not. This Argument (continues Saravia) that they make against the Popish Prelats and ours, is frivolous, for it's deduc'd from the Deeds of the Infidels, and hath no place among Christians. Tho' (n) Bishops have Bands of arm'd Men to guard'em, and Noble-men adorn'd with golden Chains constantly to Page and attend them; this ought to offend no Body. And whatsoever he says for covering this Scandal that such superlative Grandour, Pomp and Vanity give to every sober Beholder, his Reader shall find to be nothing else save what's commonly brought to palliat the Offence which the World so justly takes at the Luciferian Pride and Arrogance of the great Antichrist: yea even long after that time, notwithstanding of all the endeavours of Saravia and his Compli-

(i) Exam. Theol. Quatuor Quest. Insignium, Quest. 1. pag 58. Saraviam vero suis Belgium orthodoxum non annumerat, utpote &c. (k) Epist. dedicat. ad Episcopos Anglicanos præfixâ libris de gradibus Ministrorum, et alibi pluries. (l) De gradib. Ministrorum cap 24. et alibi. (m) De honore Præsulibus et Presbyteris debito. cap. 19. (n) Cap. 29.



ces, so great a Stranger was this Doctrine even there, that T. Holland (o), the King's Professor at Oxford branded Laud with publick infamy for asserting the divine right of Episcopacy.

(\*) Spanhem. part. spec. pag. 221. *Quis se. Laudum pro gradu disputantem asserentemque Episcoporum ordinem esse divini ac necessarii juris, publica ignominia notavit.*

## Section X.

*Some of the manifold inconveniences and noxious Qualities of Prelacy briefly mention'd.*

**I** Might, in the next place, enlarge on its Concomitants and Qualities: a few whereof I shall only name. One of these was a direfull Spirit of Persecution, which still rag'd during the Prelatical Government, the sad effects whereof, through no small part of this Kingdom, on both Bodies and Consciences of the best part of Protestants therein, and that for their refusal of the very things which many of the Urgers acknowledg'd to be altogether indifferent, are but too well known.

§. 2. Another of its Qualities, little better than the former, is their Schismatical Practice and Principles; as for instance, at the last return of Prelats, the Church of Scotland, whatsoever Differences might have been therein, yet was but one, and not Altar against Altar: did they not then become the Authors of a compleat National Schism, while they broke the whole Church into Parties, to the end (only) they might establish such things as many of themselves acknowledg'd to be indifferent? Again, their re-entry into Scotland was so far from being Legal, that it wanted the very colour of all Order & Law: for no General Assembly of whatsoever kind introduc'd them. Seeing then this Church has, ever since her return from Rome, held General and National Assemblies for her supream Judicatory, and Prelats were extruded by full National Assemblies, they ought, for their re-entry without the like Authority, to be accounted, by all true Members of the Church of Scotland, manifest Violators of all her Laws and Authority. And while they upbraid

braid us with the Crime of Separation, are exactly like these, who, having overturn'd all fundamental Laws of a Society, and ruin'd all both Officers and Members cleaving thereto, should moreover reproach them, upon this very account, that they would not subscribe to the overthrow of their fundamental Laws and Constitution. But marvel not tho' they made so wide a Breach here; for they give but too much ground to judge, that they have separated themselves from the Body of the reform'd Churches; as appears, amongst other things, in their Doctrine and Practice of Re-ordaining all who come over unto them from these Churches. Some indeed would persuade us, that they hold this but as a small Ceremony; but yet it's such an one, as, for ought I can learn, they will never quite with, notwithstanding of all the Scandals giv'n or taken thereby. And the most earnest Asserters of Episcopacy have their Episcopal Ordination in such esteem, that they account none true Ministers without it; and so look on most of the Reform'd Churches as being without all true Ministers, & consequently without either true Preaching or true Sacraments. And is not this too like a *Donatistick* Schism? And is it strange then that our Church did still, with greatest care and vigor, tho' on this account only, oppose Prelacy and Prelatists, they being generally leaven'd with such dangerous Principles?

And here observe that all the Heats and Debates that were in our Church since her Reformation from Popery, owe their Original, either more directly, to Prelacy, while she strove to keep or drive it out of *Scotland*: or more indirectly, while some (if on good ground or otherwise, I determine not) greatly feared that some Persons or Practices would prove introductive thereof; and therefore, against the mind of others; sought to have them laid aside. And thus Prelacy, whither present or absent, hath still been the bane of this Church. And there's little doubt, but that they were so wise, in their Generation, as both to kindle and blow at the fire of any Division that happen'd.

§. 3. And, as they give but too evident signs of their separating from the Body of the reform'd Churches, so, in too many things they but too nigh approach the Romanists. Their Government and Hierarchick Scale is one and the same, save one roundle, with that of *Rome*. All their Arguments they bring, either from Scripture or Antiquity, are learn'd from *Bellarmino* and such Romanists, and admit no less improvement for the evincing a papal Authority, than the Bishops have made there-

of for the establishing of their prelatical Power. The Romanists affirm, that the Apostles and Evangelists were Prelats of particular Diocesses, and that a power properly Apostolick still remains in the Church. In these and other such Positions too many of our Episcopal Men are ready to follow them. But leaving the Apostolick times, descend to the subsequent Ages call'd *Antiquity*, there, they're *Pylades* and *Orestes*, mutual Supporters of one another, and have, in arguing from this Fountain so great a resemblance, that you shall scarce know with whither of the two ye are dealing. Neither, as we have already touch'd, in the Topicks they pretend to draw from Reason, as that of Order and the like, is there between them any less Consanguinity.

§. 4. The Practice also of our Prelats both former and latter bore no small resemblance to that of the Romanists, while they affected so earnestly a secular Grandour, and the sullying the purity and simplicity of the Gospel, with a mass of Superstition and Romish Ceremonies. The affection of too many of that Party to *Rome* was also visible in their earnestness to get and keep a zealous Papist upon the Throne, and in their melancholick and Pannick-fears at any appearance of our Relief from Slavery and imminent danger of Popery. And lastly, in their excessive Joy when any hope of our Delivery seem to have been crush'd and blasted. All this was most legible in their Practice at the appearance of the Duke of *Monmouth* and the Earl of *Argyle*, and the failing of their Designs. They were no less gall'd and vex'd at the most noble and happy Design of his present Majesty, praying, in the chief Churches of this Kingdom, *that he, might be sunk as a Stone in the mighty Waters*. And after his entry that, *as his Army came in one way, it might be scatter'd seven ways*.

§. 5. Add to all this, their either more indirect, or down-right calumniating and maligning of the reform'd Churches and first Reformers, placing them in the same Category with Papists. Take for instance the frontispicial Lines of *Nelson's Collections*,

*Like Bifrons Japus next does court your eye*

*Rome and Geneva in Epitome,*

*They squint two ways in the main Point agree.*

And indeed this is but their kindest dealing. Neither do they then speak as they think; for their Love and Charity is by many degrees greater toward the Romanists, than to the reform'd Churches. They will

will admit none of the latter to a pastoral Office if they refuse Re-Ordination; but kindly receive a Romish Priest without it. Of the most learn'd and godly Protestant Dissenters from them, they speak most contemptuously (a) terming them *Arch-schismatics*. But the Jesuit *Bellarmino*, and *Baron* the Popish grand Legendarie, they with greatest deference call *most eminent Cardinals*. Yea even in the chief Churches of this Kingdom, they repeated their invectives against our first Reformers and Reformation, and in some Churches thereof, they were not ashamed to say, that *our Reformation was Deformation: Knox deserved stocks*. On the other hand, not a few of 'em all along shew'd no little warmth of affection to Papists, intitulating them to the same God, and Heaven with themselves, and asserting their neighbourhood and conjunction to be infinitely more eligible than that of these whom they call'd *Phanatics*, as appears, for instance, in a printed Sermon of Mr *Mcqueen*. And *Heylin* (b) says, that *the Genevan Discipline was begotten in Rebellion, born in Sedition, and nursed up by Faction*. And indeed this Author is an Enemy so open and implacable to all the reform'd Churches, that *Strada*, *Gretser*, *Becan*, *Campian*, or the like most fiery and venomous Loyolites could scarce, with all their impudent slanders and infernal rage, out-do, yea or equal him. With such stuff most of his Works, and especially his *History of the Presbyterians*, are wholly cramm'd. Yea, he doubts not (c) to call both *Luther* and *Calvin* *Manichæes*, i. e. such as hold two infinite Beings, or two Gods. Others of the Faction, as *Dodwell*, are ready to pronounce all, who dislike Diocesan Episcopacy, guilty of the *Sin against the Holy Ghost*. But the World hath now seen, that the most fiery of such Zelots at length threw off the Mask, and profess'd themselves Romanists: as for instance *L'Esrange* or else, which their own Dr. *Burret* (d) observes of *Heylin*, *one would think they had been secretly set on by these of the Church of Rome*. And so, they were, in their profession of Protestantcy, hateful Hypocrites, that they might the more easily bespatter and gore the protestant Religion through the sides of Presbytry. Others of 'em are yet more down-right Atheists, who, if they hear the wrath of God, and Hells torments denounc'd against impenitent Sinners, will tell you (e) that such a Doct-

(a) Dr. *Pearson*. *proem. ad vind. St. Ignat.* (b) *Hist. of the Presbyterians*. Page 0. (c) *Hist. Quinquart.* Pages 5, 6. (d) Preface to the second Vol. of his *Hist. of the Reformation*. (e) *Hovel. Fam. Lett.* Pages 471, 472.

ctrine came from a Winter-Preacher, so that if a Schyrtian or Groenlander, who are habitu'd to such extream cold, had heard him, they would have thought he preach'd of Paradise. And some call the Doctrine of Communion with God and Faith in Jesus Christ, fine Fables and Stories. Behold the Men who make it their chief Work to adore the Hierarchy, and inveigh against Presbytry: which brings to mind the saying of Tertulian, (f) that Christianity must needs be some excellent thing, seeing only Nero and such Monsters were its prime Persecuters. Some there are also (as their own Edwards (g) relates) even of their Reverend Divines, who turn all the *Mosaick History* concerning Adam and Eve, the Serpent, Paradise, eating the forbidden Fruit, and all the passages relating to them, into Parable, yea into Ridicule; saying that Moses only so talk'd in compliance with the blockish, and thick skull'd Israelites, but not a syllable of truth is in all that he saith. This is very strange language (subjoins Edwards) from a Reverend Divine, who thereby destroys the whole system of Theology, and of Christianity itself. And yet, for such black and hainous Crimes we can't hear that they undergoe the least degree of Censure. In my Judgement, (saith Edwards) if there be no publick Censure pass'd upon such a daring Attempt as this, by a Member of our Church, Atheists will have just ground to laugh at our Discipline. And here in Scotland, all along during their Reign, how closely did they connive at such Irreligion, as also, at all the growth and progress then made by the active Spirit of Popery: and in stead of being providers against such Pests, some of our Prelats at Court prov'd Mediators in their behalf, saying, that there was less to be fear'd from Papists than from Phanaticks. And in answer to some imputing gross Enormities to the Church of Rome, said, that such things were only to be ascrib'd to the Court of Rome, not to the Church of Rome. Add hereto the great love of not a few of 'em to the Pelagian, Jesuitick or Arminian Doctrines, Hypotheses clean contrary to the belief of all the reform'd Churches; and more especially to that of the Church of Scotland. They pretend notwithstanding, as if the establishing of Prelacy were the debarring of Popery. Episcopacy (say (h) they) was so far from being judg'd a step to it, that the ruine of the Episcopal Authority over Presbyters, and the granting them exemptions from the jurisdiction of their Ordinary, was the greatest advance the Roman Bishop ever made in his tyrannical Usurpation over Churches.

[f] Apolog. Cap. 5. [g] Of the stile of the Scriptures. Page 34. et seq. [h] Burnet's Confer. Page 323.

*I need*

I need not here tell so known a matter, as is that of the exemption of the Regulars, who being subject to their own Superiours and Generals, and by them to the Pope, were sent through the World in swarms; and with great shows of Piety, Devotion, and Poverty, carried away all the esteem, and following from the secular Clergy; who were indeed become too secular, and these were the Popes Agents and Emissaries, who brought the World to receive the Mark of the Beast, and wonder at her. For before that time, the Popes found more difficulty to carry on their Pretensions, both from secular Princes and Bishops: but these Regulars being warranted to Preach and Administer the Sacraments without the Bishops licence, or being subject and accountable to him; as they brought the Bishops under great contempt, so they were the Popes chief Confidants in all their treasonable Plots against the Princes of Europe. And when at the Council of Trent, the Bishops of Spain being weary of the insolencies of the Regulars, and of the Papal Toke, design'd to get free from it. The great Mean they propos'd, was to get Episcopacy declared to be of Divine Right, which would have struck out both the one and the other. But the Papal Party fore-saw this well, and oppos'd it with all the Artifice imaginable: and Lainez the Jesuit, did at large discourse against it; and they carried it so, that it was not permitted to be declared of Divine Right. And by this, judge if it be likely that the Papacy owes its rise to Episcopacy. The emptiness of which discourse is apparent. For,

First, The tendency and nature of Prelacy, and the Topicks whereon they Found it, aiming no less at one Head over all, then at one Prelat over a few Churches, make evident, that he touches not the Argument in hand, only giving out that some time by one accident or other, the humbling, and depression of the Prelats prov'd the Popes exaltation.

Secondly, Strange, I'm sure, and most demonstrative must the Reasons be that make null clear Matters of Fact, or persuade Men that such things have never been; and 'tis undeniable that the Councils and other Caballs, which from time to time rais'd the Pope gradually to his present height, were all consisting of, or manag'd by Bishops; and if any hapen'd to spurn at his rising, the Pope got still far more then a plurality to crush them: and indeed 'twas impossible the Pope should have risen by any other means, the whole sway of Church Affairs and guidance thereof being then in the hands of Bishops: wherefore if the Pope was rais'd to despotick Sovereignty, whereby he might absolutely dispense of Church Affairs, and trample at pleasure on the fairest mitres, they only



only are to be blamed, having themselves advanc'd him to this transcendental Preheminency.

*Thirdly*, Neither are the Bishops less guilty of this the Popes exaltation, upon the account of their profound sloth and negligence: the Author well observes, *that they were become too secular*, and indeed they were so immers'd in Luxury and Ambition, that providing they might wallow in their Lusts, and obtain from the Pope a Domination over other Churches, they little valued any thing else.

*Fourthly*, But 'tis yet more admirable how he can alledge, *that the Regulars brought the World to receive the Mark of the Beast*: as if the Bishops (for this he must intimat or he says nothing) had been innocent; he's too learn'd not to know that gross Papal Darkness had over-spread the World ere ever any such Exemptions were giv'n, or the *Regulars* distinguished from *Seculars*. 'Tis true indeed that the swarms of *Freres* were amongst the most pestiferous Locusts, the World hath been pestered withall, but, to lay all or the greatest share of this Guilt of exalting the Pope, on their shoulders, is a shrewd evidence of partiality; nothing being more notour, then that as the Bishops were the main Assistants and Supporters in every Innovation he decreed, so they with the greatest care, rigour and fury press'd them on both Clergy and People.

*Fifthly*, That the wicked fraternities in the several Orders of *Regulars*, were the Popes Agents in contriving, and sometimes effecting the ruine of Kings and Princes, is but too well known and evident enough; yet that the Prelats were no less guilty, and far more efficacious herein, is no less deniable. Were there no Bishops supporting the Pope in his War against the Emperour *Barbarossa*? Did not a crew of the same Cattel join him in Dethroning *Henry the IV*? And at a word, where did ever the Pope make his impresses, but he was strength'd by their arm and support.

*Sixthly*, But tho' Episcopacy at the Council of *Trent* had been declar'd of *Divine Right*, what great relief had this been, either from the Papal Yoak, or insulencies of the *Regulars*; it might perhaps for the time have procur'd some more Honour to the *Bishops* for the *Pope's Italians* of other Orders: but might not the Pope notwithstanding, by his boundless Authority and Supremacy he pretends over all *Bishops*, have continued to gall and oppress their Order, and also send, especially where the negligence of Prelats invited him, his Missionaries through the World,

World, yea thus the *Pope's* power paramount had not once been touch'd at that *Council*, or hurt by such a Declaration. Was his infallibility ever there question'd by the Bishops? Did they at all endeavour the removal of the unsupportable Burdens and Slavery the Church groan'd under? And should it not have been a great benefit to the Church, or diminishing the *Pope's* power, tho' his Holiness had pleased to declare the Divine Right of their Office?

*Seventhly*, But whatever it was the Bishops aim'd at in the *Council of Trent*, I'm not much concern'd; only I would gladly know, how from this their Action it follows that Bishops had never been the Men, or *Episcopacy* one of the means whereby the *Papacy* had been brought into the World; which is the Author's Inference, and is just as one should reason thus: some of *Alexander's* Macedonian Souldiers, vex'd with his tyranny and insolence, and his preferring of Strangers, attempted his down-throw: (the like may be said of some of the Souldiers of *Julius Caesar*, *Galba*, *Didius Julianus*, *Maximinus* and others) therefore they had not contributed to the raising and absolute Supremacy of these Princes. And should not such an one be reckon'd an admirable Logician? And yet this Inference should be far more pardonable than the former; in so much as the thing the Bishops aim'd at against the *Papacy*, if it can be call'd any thing, came infinitely short of what these Conspirators attempted upon the powers they deem'd unsupportable.

And by this, judge if the most earnest efforts of their chiefest Authors make it in the least improbable, that the *Papacy* owes its rise to *Episcopacy*: and if such pitifull paralogisms proclaim not, that they can really find nothing wherewith to cover *Prelacy* from the heavy; but just imputation of being the certain introductive of Popery.

§. 6. This odd reasoning of the Doctor minds me of another of his of his Essayes, or Retorsions which is of Kin to this Argumentation. *May not one* (saith he (i)) *that quarrells a standing Ministry, argue on the same Grounds, a Ministers Authority over the People, gave the rise to the Authority Bishops pretend over Ministers, and so the Minister will be concluded the first step of the Beast's Throne?* But this retorsion, being once handl'd, shall hurt us no more, then what we have already removed; for take a Gospel Ministry unconfounded with a *papal Hierarchy*, and then there is not the least colour or pretext for any Man's ascribing to it

the first rise of Popery, the parity we plead for among Pastors of Flocks secures a *Gospel-Ministry* from any force or appearance of reason in any such assault: whereas (on which I'm not now to dwell) the Topicks establishing *Prelacy*, tend no less to assert a *Papacy*. But again the belief of a *Gospel-Ministry* as a thing altogether necessary for the Being of a Church, is so well and so universally rooted in the hearts of all Christians, that they, compar'd with the rest, have scarce amounted to a handfull who had the boldness to deny it; and so there's little hazard to be fear'd from these few contemptible Objectors: and tho' there seem'd to be, and the Objection should appear never so pungent, yet it could be really of no weight against so necessary and indispensable an Ordinance. Whereas on the other hand, there's so little necessity of *Prelacy*, that the far greatest and best part of its Abettors, and in these the Author himself (as in due time shall appear) grants, that 'tis no different Order from *Presbytry*, has no footing in the Word of God, and in a word to the overthrow of his Principles, confounds a Prelat with a parochial Pastor.

Another grand, but just prejudice against the Hierarchy, is the looseness and prophanity most frequently cleaving thereto: how prophane and scandalous they and theirs were, during former *Prelacy*, has already appear'd: of the latter the matter is no less evident; for at such a height & growth during their Government, yea under their wings did prophanity, abusing of God's blessed Name, and such gross immoralities arrive, that to abstain from such vices and follow piety, was a Crime well nigh able to make a Man pass for a *Wag* and *Phanatick*; and what hazard did ensue these Sir-names, none is ignorant. All this and much more was not only evident to the body of this Kingdom, but was also notic'd abroad: and, amongst others, by their Friend R. Coke. Yea his Majesty, whom Divine Mercy sent for our Relief, well knew't, and accordingly, in his Declaration for Scotland, has, amongst many others, this most memorable Sentence. *Although (saith He) the Dissenters have just cause of distrust when they call to mind how some hundreds of their Ministers were driven out of their Churches without either Accusation or Citation: the filling of many of whose Places with Ignorant and Scandalous Persons hath been one great occasion of all those Miseries which that Country for a long time hath groan'd under. They may pretend that such Enormities were only accidental to Prelacy, which may fall out under any Government: but none*

versant

versant in Church Story is ignorant how much mischief and scandal this Hierarchy hath cast upon Christianity. Let them read *Socrates* and other Records of these more ancient times, and they shall find that the *Prelats*, tho' but beginning to appear, and by far, not so degenerate from the simplicity of the Gospel as afterward by their swelling tyranny, and aspiring to Domination, induc'd the People to commit the most lewd and vile Pranks readily imaginable, to the doolfull scandalizing of *Jew* and *Gentile*, and their utter abominating of Christianity it self: as is clear from the miserable Havock, Destruction and Slaughter, the contrary Factions of Bishops in the Plea for the Episcopal *See* between *Damasus* and *Ursinus* prompted the People to commit, from the most scandalous Pranks of *Theophilus* Bishop of *Alexandria*, the most unhumane and barbarous concomitants and consequents of the Deposition of *Chrysostome* with many other such open Impieties, all caus'd and occasion'd by the Prelatick pride and insolency, which publick and most scandalous Enormities, had the Christian World retain'd the truly Primitive and Apostolick Parity we plead for, could never have hapned: for had the Superiority, Riches, and Grandour, the very aples of these most unchristian Contentions, been wanting, and had every Pastor been kept at the earnest labour of Teaching, Exhorting, and Catechising a particular Flock or Congregation, with only such a competent Stipend as suffic'd to secure him from the contempt of Poverty, not to feed Luxury, Grandour and such like Vices, there had been no occasion of such lamentable Broyls. This was observ'd by *Nazianzen*, who himself was Bishop of *Constantinople*, and therefore he earnestly wish'd (k) that there had been no primacy of Place, no Prelacy, no Prerogative, no Superiour or Inferiour Degrees of Pastors. The marrow of *Saravia's* Answer (l) to this most cogent place of *Nazianzen*, is that he finds no fault with the Order of Degrees themselves but with Men, and with the times wherein the ambition of the Arrians troubl'd the Church. The common and blunt shift of the Romanists whereby to palliat the unlawfullness of their Papacy, and a real and clear contradiction of *Nazianzen's* plain words. And was not afterward the Papal and Prelatical pride, and affectation of secular rule the prime source of the unspeakable Evils that reign'd all along before the Reformation, and yet continue in the Papacy? Is not that Kingdom

(k) Orat. 28. (l) Def. tract. De diversis gradibus Ministrorum  
Evan. elii. C. p. 23.

where Prelacy is of most account fill'd with the most idle, naughty, and profane Clergy-men that are to be found, at least, in the Protestant World? And how can it be otherwise, seeing things or Offices retaining little or nothing of what did primitively constitute them, produce quite contrary effects to these design'd by the Authors thereof? But nothing is more plain, than that the simplicity of the Gospel-Ministry is alter'd into a secular Grandour, more by far, resembling the Princes of the *Gentiles*, than the Apostles of our *Meek and Lowly Jesus, who came not to be ministered to, but to Minister*. Now the best of things once degenerat become most noxious; what can therefore be expected from such but that they should suit their Government and Policy, change the Spirit of a Gospel-Ministry for that of Pomp and Secularity, grow intirely **Carnal**, and so become the source of Prophanity in stead of Holiness?

---

Part

---

# Part II.

*Wherein the Epistles of Ignatius are more particularly consider'd, and the Plea of the Hierarchicks therefrom, examin'd.*

## Section I.

*Of the Author and his Work.*



**T**is evident and clear to the more thinking and ingenuous part of the Christian World, how *Rome's* Advocats, while they Agent her Cause from the truly Canonical Writings of the Apostles and Prophets, after some few struglings, sorry evasions and feeble resistance, are compell'd to give back, and, in reality, abandon their Posts: but were they permitted to use Apocryphal Writings, which, they say are Ancient enough, and written not long after the Holy Scriptures; were not these also pull'd out of their hands by demonstrating the spuriousness thereof; they should perhaps make a greater appearance, and keep the fields somewhat longer.

The same also is the fate of other Hierarchicks pleading the Cause of *Episcopacy*: for while they manage it from Scripture-grounds, you may perceive them to make so wide and incoherent Deductions, so slender and pitifull Defences, so wild and unbottom'd Distinctions, as loudly



proclaim that, except they procure Auxiliaries from some other where, they must also desert their Cause, and leave the Field to their Adversaries. But let them descend somewhat lower to Ecclesiastick Antiquities, we shall find their confidence stronger: for they then bring a multitude of great Names, as so many arm'd Champions marshell'd in Rank and Order. Among these there be some, wherewith, as with so many Elephants, they threaten to make vast lanes among their Adversaries: but there's no great cause of terror; for if they be but boldly confronted we shall then find them either, like these Elephants *Ctesias* and *Diodore* fable to have been us'd by their fictitious *Semiramis*, deceitfull Images and hobgoblins to strike a vain fear in their Enemies: or like the African Elephants in *Polybius*, which, instead of destroying the adverse Party, frequently turn'd back, dissipated and overthrew these who brought them to the Battel. The greatest of these, and whom they with most confidence produce, is their Epistolick *Ignatius*, who is to them as one of the *Hee-goats* and *Rams* before the Flock, of whom they boast as if nothing should stand before him. It shall not therefore be amiss if (as we promis'd) we look more narrowly into this their bold Assertion, and examine if their Grounds be equal to their Confidence.

§. 2. *Ignatius*, as *Eusebius* (a) relates, was a Bishop or Pastor of *Antioch*, and being brought to *Rome* in the time of *Trajan* the Emperour, gloriously laid down his Life for the Cause of Christianity. He is said to have written in his Journey to *Rome*, several Epistles, viz. To the *Smyrneans*, to *Polycarp*, to the *Ephesians*, to the *Magnesians*, to the *Philadelphians*, to the *Trallians* and *Romans*, all which are either mention'd or cited by *Eusebius*. There are other Epistles also by Writers of a much later date, ascribed to *Ignatius*; but in the first seven only do our Adversaries place the weight of their Cause; and therefore with them alone we shall be concerned.

§. 3. Of these Epistles in the former Century, first in Latine and then in Greek, appeared at the first but two or three only; afterward they amounted to fifteen, all which they Father'd upon *Ignatius*: these were greedily hugg'd by the Romanists; and reason they had so to do, most of these Epistles being fraughted with stuff that savour'd of the Romish Innovations, and proclaim'd them several Centuries posteriour to *Ignatius* his Age, and accordingly these Editions were scarce born while

(a) Hist. Ecclef. Lib. 3. Cap. 36.

they were condemn'd and stigmatiz'd by the most learn'd of the Re-  
form'd viz. *Calvin*, the *Magdeburgick Centuriators*, and afterwards by  
*Whittaker*, *Perkins*, *Sculter*, *Rivet*, and others, as the issue of a quite  
other Parent than him of whom they boasted.

§. 4. Notwithstanding hereof the Advocats for Prelacy, such as  
*Whitgift*, *Bilson*, *Donnam*, *Heylyn*, *Taylor* and the rest of the Party, lean'd  
on these Epistles as firm propes of their Cause, giving severals of 'em  
the Epithets of *Learned* and *Pious* without the least exception. Thus,  
for a long time, were these Epistles condemn'd by many, yet applauded  
by a few.

§. 5. But at length the most learn'd and famous Dr. *Usher* lighted  
on two Latine Manuscripts, much differing from the former Editions,  
and containing many passages cited by the *Ancients*, that were wanting  
in the former. And loon after *Isaacus Vossius* produc'd a Greek Coppy  
out of the Duke of *Tuscanie's* Library, in many things agreeing with  
*Usher's* Manuscripts. These Coppies bred a wonderfull confidence in  
the minds of the Episcopal Party: after which every one of them gave  
his loud *evynze*, and therewith pleas'd themselves, as if the Controver-  
sie concerning Prelacy had been already determin'd by a *Divine Oracle*.  
But in the mean while, and by this very A<sup>ct</sup>ion of imbracing and extol-  
ling this new Edition, as the only genuine Coppy of *Ignatius*. They  
publish'd to the World that they had all along (while in conjunc<sup>tion</sup>  
with Romanists and in opposition to Protestants they so passionatly pro-  
pugn'd the former Editions) either been lamentably shallow in their  
knowledge of *Ecclesiastick Antiquity*, notwithstanding their great boast  
thereof, as if all Men beside were Dwerfs herein: or, which is little  
better, exceedingly partial in favours of their Cause and Interest. How-  
ever, maugre all such Impeachments, they alter their Judgements as  
they see fit, reject what they had but the other day warmly hugg'd, and  
applaud their new *Ignatius*.

§. 6. Yet also they were their alone herein: for the most learn'd,  
and these of the reform'd Churches who were most able to give Judge-  
ment concerning such Controversies, as *Blondel*, *Salmasius* and others  
continu'd in their former Sentiment, believing that these new Copies  
did as really ly under just suspicion as the Old. After divers Re-encoun-  
ters amongst learn'd Men concerning these Epistles, *Dallaus* a learn'd  
*French Minister* wrote more largely and directly to evince them spuri-  
ous

ous, but was oppos'd by Dr. Beverige, and D. Pearson who wrote his *Vindiciæ Ignatiana*, a large and laborious Work, to prove that these Epistles were the genuine product of *Ignatius*, in which his Party triumphed not a little, apprehending that this Matter was decided; so as there was no more Dispute or Opposition to be feared. But 'twas not long till *Daille's* Defence was undertaken by *Monsieur L'arroque* another learn'd Pastor of the French Church: and being again oppos'd by *Pearson* and *Beverige*, wrote a second time concerning the same Subject.

§. 7. But such Arts were us'd as suppress'd and still'd the Work of this learn'd Author: of which Book *L'arroque's* Son, in his Life, prefix'd to his *Adversaria Sacra* gives us this account, (a) *He publish'd his Observations on Pearson's vindiciæ Ignatianæ, and Beverige's Annotati- ons, which came to the light by this occasion: John Daille being departed this Life, two great Englishmen who had procur'd to themselves a perpetual Fame, of whom the one lately deceas'd, had the Name of the Bishop of Chester, the other was adorn'd with the Title of Dr. but deserv'd a greater Dignity, exploded what Daille had written concerning Ignatius his Epistles. But L'arroque in favours of his deceas'd Friend, undertook the Patrocinium of this Hero; and except Fame be altogether false, has fortunately defended his Judgement. These Observations were again assaulted by the famous Beverige, to whom our Author preparing an Answer, which we have by us, almost perfected, thro' the Importunity of some Friends was suddenly turn'd another way. This he did the more willingly, both because he had done enough in favours of his dead Friend, and also that he might make it appear, that seeing while he was yet fresh, he sound'd a retreat, he had unwillingly entered the Lists with the English Protestants. Thus he, and who these Friends were, we are inform'd by another Author, a Man of the Episcopal Perswasion, and therefore may the better be believ'd in this Matter, viz. Jos. Walker Translator of L'arroque's History of the Eucharist, who, describing the Life of L'arroque, which he prefixes to his Translation, tells us, that at the request of some Persons favouring Episcopacy, he did not finish this his second Piece. From these Authors it's sufficiently evident, that the issue of this Debate concerning Ignatius his Epistles, was neither advantageous nor honourable to the Favourers of Episcopacy; seeing by such doings they acknowledg'd their Adversary so formidable that, except by powerfull Sollicitations*

(a) *Typis mandavit Observationes in Ignatianas Pearsonii vindicias nec non in Beverigii Annotationes— cui responsum parens, quodque præ manibus ferme absolutum habemus, Autor noster, instantibus quibusdam Amicis, alio subito divertit. Sed autem &c.*

and charms the Storm were diverted, nothing less than the utter ruine of their Cause was to be feared: Now, by these their dealings so dishonest both first and last, judge if such Men don't at once bewray extrem want of candour and diffidence in their Cause. And this much was meet here to be premis'd in favours of many, who may have been stumbled at the great Name of *Ignatius*, and yet altogether Strangers to the thoughts of the more learn'd, and ingenuous concerning the Epistles that bear his Name.

§. 8. In this *Ignatius* the Patrons of the Hierarchy wonderfully please themselves, and triumph (b) as if from thence Prelacy receiv'd a most sufficient support and proof, well nigh infallible, of its divine Institution, and that if these Epistles be his, Presbytrie's undone. For, if we believe them, *Ignatius* is for *authorita* or genuineness of these Epistles above the smallest suspicion of Forgery, for Antiquity and Vicinity to the Apostles, above possibility of being mistaken: and finally, for clearness in the Episcopal Cause, above doubt or scruple. Now seeing, so far as I know, little or nothing of this Subject is yet in English, and the ears of many who know no other Tongue, are perpetually beaten & deafened with a mighty noise, as if all the lofty Titles and Honours of Prelacy were adopted by a genuine and Apostolick *Ignatius*; it shall neither be improfitable nor unacceptable, if with a convenient brevity we overthrow the principal Pillars of so proud a Structure; and render the Weapons, in the estimat of our Adversaries so keen and weighty, completely unserviceable to their Cause.

§. 9. I therefore with no less confidence deny what they so boldly affirm. I deny that the Epistles ascribed to *Ignatius*, whether of the elder or later Editions, are throughly genuine, and so free of Forgeries, that no chaff hath been thrown into, and hudl'd amongst the grains of Wheat that may remain therein. I deny that the Antiquity of the true *Ignatius* was able to secure him from all Lapses and Mistakes; or that in his time some Churches might not be itching after several Novelties. I deny finally that he is so clear and positive in the Matter of Episcopacy, as to denude Presbyterians of all rational Defence, should they acquiesce in his Judgement, and herein join with their Adversa-

(b) Pearson. Proœm. ad vind. Ignat. Cap. 1. *In ea autem tractanda magni ponderis merito habita esse Sancti Ignatii Viri Apostolici, & Martyris Autoritas, &c.* Burnet's Conferences. Page 314.

## Section II.

*The first Hypothesis viz. that Ignatius is interpolated.*

**M**Y first Assertion therefore is that the Epistles ascrib'd to *Ignatius*, whether of the Elder or Later Editions, are not thoroughly genuine, nor so free of Forgeries, that no Chaff hath been thrown into and huddl'd amongst the grains of Wheat that may remain therein. As the Writings pretended to come nearest in time to the Scriptures of the Old Testament, carry notwithstanding evident Characters of a quite other time and Parent than these whereto they are falsely ascrib'd; so also the Pieces that pretend greatest proximity to these of the New Testament, afford no less just ground of suspicion. Of this kind are *Barnabas*, *Hermas* and others, all which are generally either shroudly suspected as meer Forgeries, or at least as not being without manifest corruption and interpolation. Yea *Clemens Romanus*, who, doubtless, is by far the most choice and virgin Monument of Antiquity, has notwithstanding fall'n into the like adulterous hands as the story of the Daughters of *Danaus* and *Dirce* there recounted among the Christian Sufferers, makes manifest. And herein Divine Providence is to be ador'd, and extoll'd. For had such Writings as plead for the first place after these of either Old or New Testament, not under-ly'n such impeachments, the great proximity thereof to the Prophetick and Apostolick Writings, had certainly allur'd many to take these for Canonical; whereas now they serve, in some measure, for a rampier and hedge about the Holy Scriptures: and by the manifest corruption of the Apocryphal Writings, we are taught to distinguish betwixt divine and humane Letters: wherefore it should be a Paradox and a Wonder, had *Ignatius* escap'd all such infectious Touches. But there's no ground for such admiration.

miration. For, that *Ignatius*, whither of the Elder or Later Edition, is not thoroughly genuine, and so free of Forgery and Interpolation, a few Examples shall make evident.

§. 2. For in his Epistle to the *Smyrneans*, he thus discourseth them, (a) *All of you follow after the Bishop as Jesus Christ follows the Father, and the Presbytry as the Apostles. Reverence the Deacons as the Commandment of God. Let no Man without the Bishop do any of these things that ought to be done in the Church. Let that Worship or Thanks be accounted lawfull, which is either perform'd by the Bishop himself or permitted by him. Wheresoever the Bishop appears, let there also the Multitude be present; even as where Christ is, there is also the Catholick Church. Without the Bishop it's neither lawfull to Baptize nor Celebrate the Lord's Supper or Love-feasts: but, whatsoever he approves is acceptable to God.* And again in his Epistles to *Polycarp*. (b) *Attend to the Bishop as God doth to you; my Soul for such as obey the Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons, and with such let me have my Portion in God.* And in his Epistle to the *Ephesians*. (c) *I write not to you as if I were of any account. For altho' I be bound in the Name of Christ, yet I am not perfect in Christ Jesus. For now I begin to learn and speak to you as my Teachers* And again in the same Epistle. (d) *If I in so short a time have had such familiarity with your Bishop, not Humane I say, but Spiritual, how much more do I pronounce you blessed being join'd together as the Church to Jesus Christ, as Christ to the Father; so that all things are in a harmonious Unity. Let none be deceiv'd, whosoever is not within the Altar, is deprived of the Bread of God. For if the Prayers of one or two be of much weight, how much more these put up by the Bishop and the whole Church. Whosoever therefore cometh not into the same place, he is proud and hath condemn'd himself; for it's written God resisteth the Proud. Let us make haste therefore not to resist the Bishop, to the end, that we may obey God. And be more silent any Man perceive the Bishop, let him fear him the more: for whomsoever the Lord of the House sends to Govern it, we ought to receive him as him that sends him. Let us manifest that we ought to receive the Bishop as the Lord. And again in the same Epistle, thus. (e) *I know who I am, and to whom I write, I'm condemn'd, ye live in Peace, I'm in danger, ye sure; ye are a Passage to these**

(a) πάντες τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ ἀκολουθεῖτε, ὡς Ἰησοῦς Χριστῷ τῷ πατρὶ, καὶ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ ὡς τοῖς ἀποστόλοις. τὰς δὲ διακόνους ὅς. (b) τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ προσέχετε ἵνα καὶ ὁ θεὸς ὑμῖν. ἀντιλήζον ὅς. (c) Οὐ διατάσσωμαι ὑμῖν ὡς ὁν τις. εἰ γὰρ καὶ διδίμας ἐν τῷ ὅς. (d) εἰ γὰρ ἐγὼ ἐν μικρῷ χρόνῳ τοιαύτην συνήθειαν ἔχον πρὸς τὸν ὅς. (e) οἶδα τίς εἰμὶ καὶ τίσι γράφω. ἐγὼ κατακρίτος ὅς.



who are slain in the Lord: The Disciples of Paul, sanctified, and made Martyrs, worthy, blessed, under whose footsteps let me be found when I enjoy God. And to the *Magnesian* (f) Because I was found worthy to see you in your Bishop Damas, and your worthy Presbyters Bassus and Apollonius, and my Fellow servant the Deacon Sotion whom let me enjoy, because he's subject to the Bishop as to the Grace of God, and to the Presbyters as to the Law of Christ. And again, (g) Study to do all things in the Concord of God, the Bishop presiding in the Place of God, the Presbyters in the Place of the Confession of the Apostles, and my most sweet Deacons having committed to their Charge the Service of Christ. And within a few lines. (h) Therefore as the Lord did nothing without the Father, being one with him, neither by himself nor by his Apostles; so do ye nothing without the Bishop and Presbyters. And to the Philadelphians. (i) So many as belong to God in Christ Jesus, these remain with the Bishop. And in the same Epistle. (k) I cryed in the midst of the Congregation; I spoke with a loud voice, take heed to the Bishop, the Presbytery, and the Deacons. Some-body thought that I spoke these things foreseeing a Division: but he in whom I am bound bears me witness that I had this knowledge from no Man, but the spirit preached, saying, without the Bishop see ye do nothing. And in his Epistle to the Trallesians. (l) Whom I Salute in fullness, and an Apostolick Character. And again. (m) For when ye are subject to the Bishop, ye seem not to Walk according to Men, but according to Jesus Christ. And in an other place of the same Epistle, (n) And in like manner, let all Men reverence the Deacons as the command of Jesus Christ; and the Bishop as Jesus Christ, who is the Son of the Father, and the Presbytery as the Council of God and Senat of the Apostles, without which there is not a Church, and thus I counsel you to esteem of them, for I have gotten an Example of your Charity, and retain the same with me, in your Bishop, whose very composition is a great deal of Discipline, and his mansuetude Power, whom I believe the very wicked reverence. And afterward in the same Epistle. (o) Can I not write unto you Heavenly Things? But I fear that I

(f) ἐπεὶ ἐν ἡμετέροις ἰδοὺ ὑμᾶς διὰ Δάμα τὸ ἀξιόδου ὑμῶν ἐπισκόπου, καὶ πρεσβυτέρων ἀξίων ὅς τε. (g) ἐν ὁμοφροῦνι θεῷ σπουδάετε πάντα πράττειν ὅς τε. (h) ὁ σπὸν ἐν ὁ κύριος ἀνεῖ τὸ πᾶν ἐν ἐμῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἡμετέρῃ ὡς ὅς τε. (i) ὅσοι γὰρ θεῷ ἀσπῶν καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ὅς τε. (k) ἐκταύρασα μὲν ὡς ὅς τε. (l) ὡς ἀσπῶν ἐν τῷ πνεύματι ἐν ἀποστολικῇ χαρὰ καὶ. (m) ὅς τε ἀντὶ τοῦ ἐπισκόπου ὅς τε. (n) ὁμοίως πάντες εἰς τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τῆς διακονίας ὅς τε. (o) μὴ ἔστιν αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τῇ γῆτι καὶ ἀλλὰ—καὶ γὰρ ἡμεῖς καὶ ἡμεῖς διὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν, καὶ διὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τῆς ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς, καὶ τὰς ἐκκλησίας τῆς ἀρχιεπισκοπῆς, ὁρατὶ καὶ ἀπῶν.

should

should thereby endamage you being but Children, and forgive me, least not being able to comprehend them, you be strang'd. For I am not bound in every respect, but can be able to know things Heavenly, the Orders of Angels, their Constitutions, Principalities, things visible and things invisible. And again. (p) Thus shall it be unto you if ye be not Proud, and remain unseparable from God, the Bishop and Apostolick Orders. And again in the same Epistle. (q) Farewell in Christ Iesus, if ye be subject to the Bishop, as to the command of God, and in like manner to the Presbytry.

But I'm weary, and did never translate more of any Author with less delight, or pleasure; not because I'm in the least gravell'd by what is here said concerning Bishops, altho' the whole strength, of what the *Episcopals* deduce from *Ignatius*, be wrapt up in these Passages, yea I'm perswaded, that from these very Places the Hierarchy's wounded under the fifth Rib. But because the most part of what we have quoted, as also no small part of what is behind, is altogether insulse, putide, and more tasteless than the white of an Egg: and the Reader may easily perceive by these Examples that the Spirit and genius of this Author is quite different from what can be looked for in *Ignatius* a prime *Martyr* of the primitive Church. In all these Epistles 'tis clear as the Noon-sun, that a head-strong Passion, and a furious Zeal of enslaving all Christians under an illimited and blind Obedience to all Church-men, as so many *Romish Holinesses* did intirely possess, and reign in the Author of these Epistles. The Apostle indeed sometimes admonishes the Churches of the Duties and Esteem, Christians should pay to Church-Officers; but withall uses but rarely to handle that Subject, and with the brevity and modesty that became him, ascribing to them only the Titles of *Watch-men*, and *Labourers*, *Bishops* or *Pastors* and the like, which best became the simplicity of the Gospel; whereas on the other hand, the pretended *Ignatius* so far swerves from this humble and Apostolick strain, that none, tho' they search the Writings of the most corrupt Ages, shall be able to find any that in exaltation of the Clergy, and depressing and subjecting of the Laity out did him. How secure should *Basilides* and *Martial*, two *Spanish* laps'd Bishops, have been, had their Flocks believed this *Ignatian* Doctrine, who having consulted *Cyprian* (r) *If they might not desert these and chuse new Bishops, were by him resolved*

(p) τίποτε ἔσται ὑμῖν μη συστημένοις ὅς. (q) ἐρῶντες ἐν ἰησοῦ  
Χριστῷ, ὑποτασσόμενοι ὅς. (r) Tom. i. Ep. 68.

in the affirmative, and admonish'd to choose other Pastors: but had they believ'd this pretended *Ignatius*, it had been with them the blackest impiety to have separated from their Bishop, or attempted so to do on whatsoever account.

The Apostles frequently both to Pastors and Churches inculcat the diligent perusal and understanding of the Holy Scriptures as a special Duty, that by them as a sure Rule all Mens Doctrines and Injunctions (without any exception) may be tryed: but in lieu hereof, this their *Ignatius* has only Mens Persons in admiration, perpetually deafening his Hearers, or at least wearying his Readers with Injunctions of absolute and blind Obedience, as if all and every one of his Bishops Dictats were to be receiv'd without the least Examination, a Priviledge that even Christ and his Apostles (tho' they might have done it) never assumed to themselves; but still remitted their Hearers to the Scriptures for the tryal thereof: this can't but in the estimat of all the judicious, be a Fault altogether unworthy of the True *Ignatius*. I hope that all honest Men shall give more Charity to this choice Martyr, than to believe that he's guilty of so gross Idolatry- (for I can call it no better) and fantastick and impious doring on the person of any Man whatsoever: in which unworthy Work this Author (I will not say *Ignatius*) spends no smal part of these Epistles. Therefore, altho' the asserting of all therein to be genuine, be so far from assisting our Adversaries, that their Cause is, by the very Passages they alledge for its confirmation, mortally wounded; I can never persuade my self, but they have fall'n into the wicked hands of Forgers who, tainted with the common Vice of the Ages subsequent to that of *Ignatius*, soisted in a great many Passages wherein nothing but the illimited Power of all Church-men is depredicated, and the blind Obedience of the Laity is enjoin'd and commended.

I'm confirmed in my sentiment by *Ignatius* his Epistle to the Romans, who certainly had as truly a Bishop as the *Smyrneans*, *Magnesiens*, or any other saluted by *Ignatius*; but of the *Roman Bishop* or of the Honour and Obedience due to him in all this Epistle we find not a syllable. Certainly had this servile Obedience to the Clergy been such a fundamental Article of the Christian Religion, as all along through these other six Epistles he makes it, he had not failed to have inform'd the Romans thereof, seeing nothing (I believe) can be alledg'd to exime the Romans, more than other Churches, from paying such Honour to their Clergy.

'Tis

'Tis vain to repute that he was then on his Journey to *Rome*, and was shortly to see that Church, and might on this account forbear: seeing they may after this manner of arguing prove the whole Epistle spurious, or at least superfluous; this Duty of Obedience to Church-men, if we believe these six Epistles being so necessary a part of the Christian Religion, that 'tis never to be forgotten, but at all times with the greatest zeal and fervency to be inculcated.

§. 3. Yet in defence of all these most dangerous Injunctions of his *Ignatius*, Dr. *Pearson* saith (f) *That there could be no fitter remedy against Heresies then that the Churches should adhere to the Pastors whom Ignatius knew to be Orthodox.* But such an adherence as these Epistles every where command, is so far from being a Remedy against Heresies and Schisms, that, as the sad instance of the Romanists witness, it has been the greatest Augmentation, and the most deadly humour in all the Disease. But why did he not acquaint the *Romans* with this Remedy? Did he suspect their Bishop as unsound? Or thought he that every *Roman* Christian was above danger and infallible? And indeed the scarce paralellable extolling of Church-men through all the former six Epistles, & the perpetual silence thereof in that to the *Romans*, loudly proclaim, that either they were write by different Authors, or else, that they have undergone no few Additions and Corruptions, which his Epistle to the *Romans* had escaped, seeing, I think they will scarce adventure to say that the Epistle to the *Romans* sometime had in it such Injunctions of Obedience to the *Roman* Clergy, which by some chance or other were afterward obliterate.

§. 4. Again, what can we make of that proud boasting in his Epistle to the *Trallesians*, as if he had been the only Muster-Master to the *Angels*. But *Pearson* tells us (r) *That it's not strange tho' Ignatius a Bishop who had long conversed with the Apostles, could write something concerning Heavenly Things which are so often mention'd by the Apostles:* and he stiffly denies, in opposition to Daille, *That such knowledge is not giv'n to Mortals;* and perhaps (saith *Pearson*) *we know not well what Ignatius mean'd, when he wrote these things concerning Angels, and yet who will say but that he knew them himself?* And then he acknowledges that *Ignatius* discourses of his Know-

(f) Vind. Ignat. Part. 2. Page 220. (r) Vind. Ignat. Part. 2 Pages 140, 141. *Quasi vero Christiano Viro, & quidem Episcopo, & ab Apostolis edocto nulla supercelestium scientia competeret &c.*

ledge of the Nature, Dignity and Offices of the Angels; *And these Offices* (saith he) *and Dignities of the Angels, the most ancient Christians acknowledged.* And Irenæus numbers among the primitive Gifts, the *exposures of Divine Mysteries*; And Chrysostome asserts that Ignatius learn'd some more secret Instructions from the Apostles. Thus, in substance, Dr. Pearson. But we do not wonder that Ignatius knew somewhat, yea, or that he knew a large measure of Heavenly Things, providing they were such as the Apostles or Prophets had delivered, or insisted upon: 'tis true also, that both Angels and other things of that nature are mentioned by the Apostle; but without ever shewing us that Men while here below were to receive any knowledge of particular Ranks, Orders, or the way of their Government. He once *Col. 1. 16.* mentions Thrones, Dominions, Principalities and Powers, but with such a modesty, yea, and after such a manner that we learn nothing thence what measure of Knowledge the Apostle had concerning them: and indeed the inspir'd Apostle so delivers himself in this, that from his words we cannot gather so much as that there are four such Distinctions or Orders in Heaven, *whether they be Thrones, (saith the Apostle) &c.* as if he had said, if there be such Distinctions and Orders among the Inhabitants of Heaven, they were all created by Christ. Dr. Pearson therefore when he tells us that Ignatius *might know somewhat of Heavenly Things: and that these are often mentioned by the Apostle,* hath giv'n us *Quid pro quo*, and thought to silence his Adversary with meer equivocal Terms; seeing no Man shall be able to prove that the Heavenly Things in the knowledge whereof Ignatius glories, viz. the particular Order, and marshelling of the Angels their severall ranks and degrees, and the like; were ever so much as positively asserted by the Apostle: it remains therefor that this knowledge of Ignatius was beyond whatever the Apostle either taught others, or ascrib'd to himself: yet the ostentation were less unpardonable had he contented himself to have spoken soberly of this his Angelick knowledge. But while he expressees himself as if he were able to give us a competent system of Angelick tacticks, he much rather savours of a spurious *Areopagite*, than a genuine Ignatius. And yet Dr. Pearson to mend a marr'd matter the best that may be tells us that *he only might have somewhat of the knowledge of Heavenly Things*; whereas indeed, if Ignatius spoke truth, he had thereof a good measure and running over. No less vain is it for him to deny, that this knowledge is

not giv'n to any Mortal, seeing for the proof hereof it's enough to re-  
 pone the words of *Elaphas*, to which of the *Saints* wilt thou turn thee? Sore-  
 ly not to *Paul*, seeing it can never be made evident that he either taught  
 others, or ascribed to himself the knowledge of these *Ignatian* (or ra-  
 ther *Pseudo-Ignatian*) Mysteries. Altho' therefore we know not the  
 meaning of these his words, we shall (I believe) incur little hazard  
 thereby; and if he knew them himself I shall not debate. Certainly if we  
 judge of the Author by his Work, we shall have little ground to appre-  
 hend that his Judgement was of the greatest reach, for, remove a very  
 few flowers, this so much celebrated Garden shall be nothing but a den of  
 weeds: neither can better be expected, where any intrude into the things  
 they have not seen, as the Author of this Passage appears to have done;  
 boasting of that wherein neither the Pen-men of the Holy Scriptures,  
 nor the primitive Christians profess'd themselves to be skillfull: for al-  
 tho' the Ancients acknowledged that there were, or might be such Digi-  
 nities & Distinctions among Angels, yet who before the Impostor  
 that borrowed the name of the *Areopagite*, adventured to profess their  
 acquaintance with the particulars thereof? But most of all I admire that  
 he for his purpose alledges *Irenaus*, as if the Mysteries of God were no-  
 thing else but a convertible term with the Politicks or Tactics of An-  
 gels. With how much more reason may we understand the Mysteries  
 mention'd by *Irenaus*, to be these magnifi'd by the Apostle *1 Tim. 3. 16.*  
 which without Controversie are equally great and profitable.

Lastly, as to *Chrysostome*, he cites no where, wherefore I can't so easi-  
 ly make a judgement concerning him; otherwise 'tseems he may be un-  
 derstood of a greater measure of knowledge of the Mysteries frequently  
 spoken off by the Apostle. And withall I observe that *Dr. Pearson* still  
 insinuates and intimates as if *Ignatius* and other primitive Christians re-  
 ceiv'd from the Apostles other mysterious Doctrines not to be commit-  
 ted to writing, different from what is comprehended in the holy Scrip-  
 tures; wherein, notwithstanding the whole Counsel of God is deli-  
 vered, which Opinion is much fitter for a Jewish Cabalist or Romish  
 Traditionary than a Protestant Doctor.

§. 4. *M. Du Pin* (u) imbraces and only contracts *Pearson's* Answer  
 saying that the knowledge of the Orders, Offices and Stations of Angels might  
 be affirmed by an ancient Bishop, all Christians knew Heavenly Things: And



Ignatius says nothing of Angels but what had been said by St. Paul. But herein he palpably contradicts himself, and affirms what he had before denied; for (x) to prove the Forgery of these Books that bear the Arcopagites name Du Pin gives us this Argument: He (viz. the Author of these Books) distinguishes the several Orders of Angels and observes their difference, things that were unknown to the ancient Writers, and concerning which they were not solicitous to be informed, as S. Irenæus assures us, in lib. 2. ch. 55. He opposes also Dr. Pearson, who, as we have heard, deduced from this same Irenæus a quite contrary Doctrine.

§. 5. Thus far I had proceeded secure of any other Controversie concerning this Passage, when I was surpris'd to find Dr. Wake (y) the Englisher of these Epistles make Ignatius, together with his language, change his Doctrine, and speak quite contrary to what he had delivered either in Greek or Latine: for thus he Englishes the now controverted words of Ignatius. *For even I myself, altho' I am in bonds, yet am not therefore able to understand Heavenly Things, as the description of the Places of the Angels, and the several Companies of them, under their respective Princes, the things visible and invisible, but in these things I am yet a Learner.* But this Version is by no means to be imbrac'd. For first the old Greek Copy commonly said to be spurious, uses indeed to add to, and dilate what is comprehended in the New Edition, yet not so as to contradict it; and therefore may serve for an Interpreter, were there any thing dubious herein: but this Old Copy is positive in favours of the received sense, and after an enumeration of the Particulars whereof Ignatius professes the knowledge, concludes all with *ΤΙΝΕ ΤΙ ΓΙΝΟΣΚΩ* when, or altho' I know so much; and thus the Old Copy is understood by all Interpreters, as the Old Latine of Vairlenius which is printed at Antwerp 1566, and by the Author of another Version, or at least an emendation of the Old, printed amongst the *Orthodoxographa Patrum* at Basle 1569, and by Videlius, and for ought I can learn, by whosoever interpreted or revised these Epistles.

Secondly, The Cantabrigian or Usserian Copy, the Authority whereof is little inferiour to the Florentine Original, is no less positive for us against this New Interpreter; For (saith he) *I am not bound in every respect, but am able to know Heavenly Things &c.* And having enumerated the Particulars, concludes with a *præter hoc* beside or notwithstanding of

this: importing that some greater measure of that knowledge was, notwithstanding of the vast measure he had receiv'd, yet to be sought for.

*Thirdly*, All Men in their Disputes and other Discourses about *Ignatius*, have thus understood the Passage now under Debate. If the ascribing of such knowledge to himself could agree to the genuine *Ignatius* they disputed much; but that the now disputed Passage really ascribes, and not denies to *Ignatius* the knowledge of these Heavenly Things, all except this Interpreter unanimously acknowledge. And this certainly was the mind of *Isaacus Vossius* who, otherways being a zealous Patron of the *Florentine* Copy, had in his Notes doubtless taken notice of such a common mistake, and observ'd the contrariety between the *Cantabrigian* and *Florentine* Editions. And *Spanhemius* F. (2.) always supposes the sense we plead for of these words of *Ignatius*, and on this ground, notwithstanding what Dr. *Pearson* had said, shroudly suspects these Epistles as forg'd. And *Daille*, yea & even Dr. *Pearson*, his most learn'd and vigilant Adversary, always supposed as uncontrovertible, the sense we now plead for.

*Fourthly*, And reason they had so to do, seeing otherways both sense and the self consistency of this Passage is lost; he had but just now arrogat to himself such a knowledge of Heavenly Things, the very declaration whereof should be enough to overwhelm and strangle the Church of the *Tralleians*, and then as a reason or declaration of his great Knowledge, and to shew how far 'twas out of their reach, advances the Passage now in hand, whereas this Clause concerning his Bands is only introduc'd to shew the consistency between outward Troubles and spiritual Furniture. Excellently therefore and most conform to the Greek, is it rendred in the *Cantabrigian* Copy, *non secundum quodcumque ligatus sum*, I am not bound in every respect. But were this New Version admitted, *Ignatius*, while he ascribes so great a knowledge of Heavenly Things to himself, and presently afterward denies that he knew Heavenly Things, should, in esteem of all disinterested, compleat a Contradiction; whereas, according to the *Cantabrigian* and our Version of the Passage, the sense runs natively without the least appearance of any roughness.

*Lastly*, I do not remember that *καθ' ον* any where is to be rendred *al- tho'*, (which is the mind of this Interpreter) I shall not say that foresee-

ing this Passage if truly translated would prove the dead Flee and make the rest both ill favoured and justly suspected, he willfully perverted it: I should rather charitably think that out of ignorance, a far more pardonable weakness, he fell into such an Error.

§. 6. And now to proceed, I impeach not these Epistles, of their frequent mention of Bishops and their Superiority over Presbyters, as if herein they favoured a *Diocesan Prelacy*; nay I'm so far from this, that I'm perswaded from the self same places, that according to this Author a Bishop and a parochial Pastor are reciprocated; and therefore the Doctrine of our Adversaries is overthrown by the very places from which they labour to establish it. The Grounds on which I accuse these Epistles are, the Author (not to mention self Contradictions) his affected Humility, hatetull deising of all Church-men, most unworthy and parasitick flattering of whomsoever he salutes, and, which is the end of all, his endeavouring to perswade Christians, that an Autocratick Power is to be ascrib'd, and blind Obedience to be pay'd to all Church-men, as to so many absolute and unerring Deities. And lastly his audacious boasting of his Knowledge of these things wherewith, for ought we can learn either from Scripture or any Author of Credit, no meer Man hath been hitherto acquainted. And these Grounds, were there no others, may suffice at least to evince the Interpolation of the Epistles.

§. 7. And how this came to pass is not hard to conceive if we reflect upon the *genius* of subsequent Ages; the uncontrolled Power and superlative Veneration of Church-men, the special Fore-runner and introducer of *Antichrist*, together with other parts of Superstition, took special rooting in the third and fourth Centuries. Now, as the Church like a choice Garden nourish'd many prime and usefull Plants; she had also most pestilentious and noisome Weeds, Monsters which you can scarcely name, and not be transported with indignation. These, the better to promote such Impieties, Father'd the brats of their own Brains on some choice *Dr*, by whose warmth they might be cherish'd and supported. Such Men not only forg'd or (at best) polluted these Epistles, but also attributed more of the like stuff to *Ignatius*, some whereof are mention'd by *Daille* and *Dr. Pearson*, and others omitted by them, are remembered by *Socrates*, (a) who tells us that the beginning of the Anti-

(a) Lib. 6. Cap. 8. λεχθιον ὃ καὶ ἔθεν τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐλαττειν ἢ καὶ τὰς ἀντι-  
φώνους ὕμνους ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ σιωπῆσαι. Ἰγνατίου — ἐπιστάσιον ἔδωκε ἀρχιερέων, διὰ  
τοῦ ἀποφῶναι ὕμνων τὴν ἀρίστην τριτάτην ὕμνον, &c.

phones was reported to have come from Ignatius, which they said he had revealed to him by *Queers of Angels* that use to descend and sing the Praises of the holy Trinity. Add to all, which shakes the very foundation of their Plea, the incredibleness of Ignatius his Journey to Rome, whether he is said, after his Condemnation at Antioch, to have been sent by Trajan, that he might be thrown to wild Beasts, on the truth of which these Epistles leaned, still insinuating and presupposing it: But why should Trajan be at pains to have sent him guarded thither? Certainly not for an *intertainment* to the People as the pretended Acts of Ignatius affirm. They had store of Christians of all sizes at Rome with the spectacle of whose sufferings they might dayly be cloy'd, neither, as some answer, because he was a famous Christian and Bishop, at whose death the Roman Christians might be terrifi'd, seeing the Emperour might conclude from Ignatius his great resolution and boldness which himself had perceived that he would much animat them. But the perpetual Practice of these times frees us from further debate herein: I can never find that the Romans brought Christians from Asia or such remote places to be executed at Rome, but still to the nearest seats of Justice, as is clear in Polycarp and other most famous Bishops or Pastors. And truly (saith Dr. Stillingfleet (b)) the story of Ignatius (as much as it's defended with his Epistles) doth not seem to be any of the most probable. For wherefore should Ignatius of all others be brought to Rome to suffer, when the Proconsuls and the Præfides provinciarum did every where in time of Persecution execute their Power in punishing of Christians at their own Tribunals, without sending them so long a Journey to Rome to be martyr'd there? And how came Ignatius to make so many and such strange Excursions as he did by the Story, if the Soldiers that were his Guard were so cruel to him, as he complains they were? Now all these uncertain and fabulous Narrations as to Persons then arising from want of sufficient Records made at those times, make it more evident, how incompetent a Judge Antiquity is to the certainty of things done in Apostolical times.

And now from what is said, jude if D. M. (c) had any good ground to query, whether there's any good and solid Argument brought by the Presbyterians against the Authority of St. Ignatius his Epistles, that is not already sufficiently answered.

(b) Iren. Page 298. (c) Page 160.

## Section III.

*The second Hypothesis, viz. that the Antiquity of the true Ignatius could not secure him from all Lapses or Escapes in Doctrine or serve to Prove that there was no Declension in his time.*

MY second Assertion is, that the Antiquity even of the true *Ignatius* was not able to secure him from all Lapses and Mistakes, and that in his time some Churches not only might; but actually were itching after several Novelties. Which Assertion, if once demonstrated, renders *Ignatius* of little or no use to our Antagonists: their Inference is, that, if *Ignatius* spoke positively in favours of Episcopacy, and lived in a close vicinity to the Apostles, then there's no doubt but the Apostles established such a Government: which consequence, like the Aples of *Sodom*, resolves anon into smoke, our Assertion being prov'd; which I now come to demonstrate. The Apostles of our Lord had not chang'd their earthly Tabernacle, for that which is not made with hands; when, to their inexpressible sorrow, they beheld not only particular Persons, but even the greater part of some Churches, they themselves had either planted or watered, in stead of Grapes, to bring forth wild Grapes, and in place of being the Repositories of the precious Truths of the Gospel, become nests and cages of the most abominable Errors. Other Churches there were that holding fast the Foundation of the Apostolick Doctrine, but raising thereupon a structure of the stubble and hay of either *Judaism* or *Paganism* (in one of which all of them had been educated) had well nigh made up an Edifice of most Heterogeneous Materials. Hence it is that the Apostle is at such pains to Correct them in their Abuses of the Sacrament, in their Superstition concerning Meat and Drink, and their unwarrantable observation of Times, that wanted all Divine Sanction.

§. 2. But these infallible Guides being at length possessed of their Master's Joy, Affairs grew yet worse: for then the grand Enemy of the Church

Church did in greater abundance; and with more security sow his tares. Hence it was that not only those, who are justly branded for Arch-Heretics, and Schismaticks; but even those who persisted Orthodox in the main Principles of Christianity were drawn into, neither few nor inconsiderable Mistakes.

§. 3. I'm sure *Papias* Bishop of *Hierapolis* was a Man, both in respect of his Antiquity and Authority, among the primitive Christians, little inferior to *Ignatius*: 'twas he notwithstanding who either greedily imbrac'd, or first of all hatch'd the gross Fancy of the Saints their corporal Kingdom for a thousand years after the Resurrection. Moreover (saith *Eusebius* (d) speaking of *Papias*) the same Writer alledges something as from unwritten Tradition, viz. some strange Parables and 'Doctrines of our Saviour, and some other fabulous things; and, amongst the rest, he saith that after the Resurrection, there shall be a thousand years, wherein Christ shall reign on Earth bodily. But to me he seems through misunderstanding of the Apostle's Discourse, to have taken what was spoken mysteriously, in a quite other sense from its true meaning. For he was of a very weak Judgement; as his Writings sufficiently declare. He was notwithstanding the Author of this Opinion to the most part of the following Ecclesiastical Writers, for they look'd only to his Antiquity as *Irenæus*, and whosoever else favoured his Opinion. We see here a Man of no little Antiquity and Repute drawing the greatest Lights of the Church, and consequently the rest of the Christians to a Doctrine destitute of all countenance from the Word of God.

§. 4. Another Conceit no less Ancient but more wild, was that of the Angels their carnal Knowledge of women. This was hugg'd by *Justin Martyr* (e) who lived in the same Century with, yea, and not many years after *Ignatius*. The Angels (saith he) transgressing their Order, by carnal Copulation with Women, fell from their primitive State, and begot Children who are now called Devils. He was follow'd notwithstanding by *Irenæus* & *Athenagoras*, the most famous Writers of their Age; as also the stream of these that flourished in the succeeding Centuries. *Irenæus* also with a great many others held, that the beatifick Vision is not enjoy'd untill the day of Judgement. Now beyond peradventure such Lead-

(d) Lib. 3. Cap. 39. καὶ ἄλλα δὲ ὁ αὐτὸς συγγραφεὺς ὡς ἐκ παραδόσεως ὡς ἀγραδοὺς εἰς αὐτὸν ἤκοντα παρατίθεται, — σοφία γὰρ τοι σμικρὸς ὦν τὸν νοῦν — πλὴν καὶ τοῖς μετ' ἑστί. (e) Apolog. ad Senat. καὶ δὲ ἄγγελοι, παραβάντες τὴν τάξιν, γυναίκαν μίξεντες ἔσθ.



ers as these, had the most part of the Churches at that time for their Fellows and Followers in these Opinions.

§. 5. And seeing both such Pillars, and the rest that lean'd on them were ready to swerve in Matters of Speculation, or Opinion, they were no less capable of straying in things belonging to Practice; for there's no more security promised to the Church from the one than the other. Neither did the close Vicinity to the times of the Apostles, preserve the Churches from evident Lapses of this nature. Was not the mixing of the Sacramental Wine with water, a matter of Practice, and altogether destitute of warrant from Scripture, in which we hear of nothing but the Fruit of the Vine drunken by Communicants. And yet *Justin Martyr* (f) informs us that the mixing of the Sacramental Wine with water was the Practice of his time.

§. 6. Another Instance of the most early Declension of the primitive Church in Matters of the same kind, viz. the external Rites, and Ecclesiastick Ceremonies, was their observation of *Easter*; concerning which the Controversies first arose between *Polycarp* (g), and the Churches of the *East* on the one hand, and *Anicetus* and the western Churches on the other. *Polycarp* alledg'd *John* the Evangelist, whose Disciple he had been, for the Author of his Opinion: but *Anicetus* and the *Romans* pretended the Authority of *Peter* and *Paul* for the quite contrary Doctrine.

I have oftentimes much admir'd how either of these Parties, if we consider either Sincerity, or Vicinity to the Apostles, were liable to any Mistake of this kind; I believe scarce any Man now living shall be able to give any rational account of the Cause thereof; yet that one of them was mistaken, and that the Apostles did not keep up a perpetual observation of contrary Practices one to another, is to me, and to as many as truly acknowledge the Scriptures, among the things of highest certainty; and if either of them strayed, it sufficiently serves our turn, and is an ocular Demonstration that not only the clearest Lights, and nearest to the Apostles might relinquish some part of the Apostolick Purity, and fall into Rites and Customs never countenanced by the Apostles; but also be accompanied by no small part of the Church therein.

(f) Anolog. ad Antoninum pium.  $\chi$  τοῦτοιοῦ ὕδατος  $\chi$  κείνουτος ἔσται.  
(g) Euseb. Hist. Eccles. Lib. 4. Cap. 14.  $\delta$ ια τὴν ἑτήμια οὐκ ἔστιν ἡ τὸ πᾶσι ἡ  
μῖστος ἔσται. Et Lib. 5. Cap. 23. Ζητήσαντες δὲ αὐτὸν τὰς δὲ ἐν οὐκινῶς ἀνακινῶ-  
σιν. ἔσται.

§. 7. Yea I dare avouch and sustain, that both Parties equally swerved from the Truth, seeing both of them had equal Means to have inform'd themselves, and were alike nigh to the Apostles; so that many were certainly alive of both Parties who had been conversant with them: hence there's no reason to believe either of the Parties, that ever the Apostle enjoined or allowed the observation of Anniversary, weekly or monthly times either in the same time with, or so near to the Judaical, (and then buried) Ceremonies; excepting the Sabbath only, the observation whereof had been expressly enjoin'd in a clear and Moral Precept. Neither, in this Assertion, shall we remain alone, but be supported by the suffrages of the choicest of the Ancients. No less *Irenaus* in *Eusebius* intimates, while he tells us, (b) that this Difference did not arise first in his Age but long before in the time of their Fore-fathers, who (as is probable) being negligent in their Government, delivered to their Posterity a Custome, which had only crept in thro' Simplicity and ignorance. And *Socrates*, a grave and solid Author, avers (i) that, neither more Ancient nor Later who inclined to follow these Jewish Rites, had any cause to raise so great Contention. And that the keeping of Easter and such Holy Days were altogether Legal, the observation whereof is not at all injoin'd in the Gospel: for (continues *Socrates*) they did not consider that, after the Jewish Religion was changed into that of the Christians, the strict observation of Moses Law, and the shadows of future things were wholly abolished, which by a most sure proof may be thus evinced. For by no Law of Christ is it granted to Christians to observe Jewish Customs; yea the Apostle did expressly forbid it, not only rejecting Circumcision; but admonishing moreover that about Feast Days there should be no Contention, wherefore in writing to the Galatians he thus speaks, tell me ye who desire to be under the Law, do ye not hear the Law? And after he had discoursed a little concerning these Matters, he shows the Jews to be under Bondage, but that those who had followed Christ Jesus were called unto Liberty: he exhorts furthermore that Days, Months or Years, in no way be observed. Moreover, writing to the Collossians, he clearly asserts that such observations are but a meer Shadow. Wherefore, saith the Apostle, let no Man judge you in Meat or Drink, or in respect of an Holy Day, of the New Moon, or of the Sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come. But in the Epistle to the Hebrews,

(b) *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. Lib. 5. Cap. 24.* ἡ νῦν ἐστὶν ἡμεῖς μαρτυροῦμεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολὺ πρότερον ἐπὶ τοῦ πρὸ ἡμεῶν ὄντος. (i) *Socrates Lib. 5. Cap. 22.* ἡ καὶ διακρίσιν ἔτι οὐκ ἔλαβεν περὶ τῆς εορτῆς ταύτης ὁ λόγος — ἡ γὰρ εἰς νῦν ἐβαλλομένη, ὅτι τὰ ἰουδαϊσμῷ καὶ περμένει εἰς χριστιανισμῶν, &c.

S

confirm.

confirming the same matter he thus speaks. For the Priesthood being changed, there is also a necessity of the change of the Law: surely the Apostles and the Evangelists did never impose a Toak upon these that became obedient to the Doctrine of Faith, but Easter and other days were left to the choice and equity of those who in such days had received the Benefites: wherefore, seeing Men love Holy Days, because they bring them some respite of their Labours, divers Men in divers places following their particular Inclinations, did, according to certain Custome, celebrate the memory of our Saviour's Passions: for neither our Saviour, nor his Apostles did by any Law ordain that it should be observed; neither did the Gospels nor the Apostles threaten us with a Mulct, Punishment, or Curse, as the Law of Moses was wont to do to the Jews.

This and much more are we taught by Socrates; from all which it's most clear that in this Dispute concerning the Celebration of Easter, both Parties were equally culpable, as building upon a false Supposition, viz. that Christ and his Apostles had appointed some of these Days anniverſarily to be kept, which yet never came into their mind. And here 'tis most observable how, even in these most early times they heap'd Falshood upon Falshood and supported one Forgery with another: the Fable of Peter's being at Rome and conjuring of Simon Magnus there, was even then beginning to obtain; whereof the Romans made their Advantage, and began to ascribe to him some Head-ship over the rest; and then averred that he had appointed them, not only to celebrate Easter, but also had determin'd the particular day of its Celebration, and injoin'd them to keep it on the fifteenth and not on the fourteenth day of the Moneth as did the Eastern Churches: Now that they might be even with the Romans, and meet with them after their own Fashion and arts, the Asians invented the like Legends of the Apostle John, who, as they alledged, died at Ephesus and enjoyn'd them to keep Easter, but by no means on the fifteenth but on the fourteenth day of the Moneth, and the better to set off the Fable, Polycrates of Ephesus, in his Letter to Victor, harangues in the Praises of John, that thereby he might prefer him to Peter, and sticks not to assert that John was a Priest, and wore a High-Priests Golden Crown or Breast-plate (k). And yet, as is acknowledged, John was not at all of the Priestly Race, far less was he the High-priest, to whom only of all the Priests, such a Crown

(k) Euseb. Hist. Eccles. Lib. 5. Cap. 24. *Ἰωάννης—ἐνανθὶν ἱερέως το πέντα-  
λόν περιφερούς.*

Sect. 3.

*examin'd and disprov'd.*

131

was peculiar. Therefore *Valesius* \* imagines that the first Christian Priests, as he speaks, wore such a Crown for a Sign of Honour in imitation of the Jews. As if the Christians of these times had ever dream'd of retaining the very marrow of Judaism which was then abolished by the coming of Christ the substance. But this Antichristian dottage being so gross to be dejected by any real Protestant, the learned *Le Moyn* (l) says that *Polycrates* spoke metaphorically of John's supereminent Knowledge and Gifts. But if this be true, with how great caution are these Ancients to be read, without which we shall be led into the belief of the greatest falsehoods. In the mean while I see no ground for this gloss in *Polycrates* his words, either as they are related by *Eusebius* or by *Hierome* and *Rufine*. And *Epiphanius* (m) gives another such golden Crown to James, which is no less true than that he was Diocesan Bishop of Jerusalem. The same saith a Ms. Author, cited by *Valesius* (n) of *Mark* the Evangelist, viz. that *Mark* was of the Priestly Race, and according to the Custom of the carnal Sacrifice, carried publicly a Golden Crown as the Badge of his Priestly Dignity. There is indeed nothing more certain than that the primitive Doctors who are ordinarily known by the name of Orthodox Fathers, stuck with a due preciseness to the great and capital Doctrines of the Christian Religion, without any swerving therefrom: but it's no less demonstrable, as we have now made evident, that the same Leaders, and these next the Apostles of greatest Antiquity, in many other things strayed exceedingly from the true Apostolick Simplicity.

§. 8. Nothing was more frequent to them than, relying upon their Vicinity to the Apostles, to neglect a more accurate search of the Scriptures, relate things otherways than they were transacted, alledge the Apostles for Practices to which they never gave Patrociny, which, beside what we have said already, may be sufficiently vouch'd from the Relation of *Hegeippus* in *Eusebius* (o) The Administration (saith he) was undertaken by James the Lord's Brother (together with the rest of the Apostles) who from the time of Christ even unto our Age is surnamed Just, for there

\* In notis ad *Eusebii* locum. (l) *Varia sacra*. Vol. 2. Page 30. (m) *Hæresi* 29. *Νακατανημι ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἱερατεύοντα αὐτον ἔπ' τὴν παλαιὰν ἰερουσόλυμ ἐυρωμαί — ἀλλὰ καὶ τὸ πᾶν ὅτι καὶ κροσσὸς ἔξην αὐτῷ φέρειν ὅς.* (n) *Ubi supra*. *Quem quidem B. Marcus juxta ritum carnalis Sacrificii pontificalis apicis petalum ὅς.* (o) *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. Lib. 2. Cap. 23. διαδύχεται δὲ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων, ὁ ἀδελφὸς τῶ κνείνῃ ἰακωβῷ, — τῷ μόνῳ ἐκ τῶν ἀποστόλων εἰσέναι.*

were many others of that Name beside, but as for him he was sanctifi'd from the Womb, neither did he ever drink Wine or strong Drink, and did altogether abstain from the Flesh of any living Creature, neither ever came there a Razor on his Head, nor did he ever use to anoint or wash, and he only of all Men had free liberty to enter into the innermost Sanctuary of the Temple; for he was not wont to wear a woollen but a linnen Garment: he used to enter alone into the Temple, and with bended knees to pray for the People. And in the sequel of this discourse he tells us, that in the Martyrdome of this James, he was both thrown from the pinnacle of the Temple, and also beaten to Death with a Fuller's Club: a certain Priest one of the Sons of Rechab mention'd in Jeremiah, exhorting the People to milder Counsels, and that all this was done in a tumultuous way, without the least appearance of any judicial Process against this Martyr. But this Relation of Hegesippus is not only contrare to the Holy Scripture, where we are assured that the High-Priest (alone) entred into the Holy of Holies, and that the Rechabites were not of the Priestly Race, and to Josephus who informs us (p) that James being sisted before the High-Priest's Council, and by a kind of judicial Process condemn'd, was stoned to Death: but also a most insulfe Rapsody, savouring more of a Legendary than a primitive Doctor. Yet the Author thereof lived contemporary with Justin Martyr, a few years only below the Apostles.

§. 9. But of this enough, and indeed with me it had been highly Sacrilegious to have said so much, but buried in a perpetual silence the Escapes of these whose memory is otherways to me more precious than the ashes of Mausolus to his Ariemisia; and in fragrancy far surpassing the choicest of Oriental Spices; did not the injustice and importunity of these who prefer the Escapes, yea and Extravagancies of Men, and the blemishes of these great Lights, yet but terrene Lights, to the unspotted Beams of the Father of all Lights, compell me hereto. And herein I'm a true Son of the primitive Church, whose Doctors have taught me, that when the Dictats of God and these of Men, whosoever they be, interfer, and thro' humane Corruption are set in Competition, I ought to hold to the first; and in comparifon herewith, despise the latter.

§. 10. Add hereto, that seeing Antichristianism the Mystery of Ini-

(p) Ant. judaica. Lib. 20. Cap. 8. καὶ παραγὰν εἰς αὐτὸν τὸν ἀδελφόν Ἰ-  
 ησοῦ τὸν λεγόμενον χριστὸν, ἰσχυρῶς ὄνομα αὐτοῦ, καὶ τίνας ἐτεροί, ὡς ἑξαπομισατων  
 κατηγορίαν περιέθηκε λευτερομένους,

quity was working even in the Apostles days, seeing this Defection was mysteriously promoted, and seeing, as experience hath proved, it arrived at its hight, and *Antichrist* was brought to his Throne by the exorbitant elevation of Clergy-men, it's much less to be wondred at, if the most frequent Escapes and Lapses of the Primitive, and otherways *Orthodox*, *Fathers* chanced to be of this nature, and tend to the establishing an unwarrantable Supremacy and Dignity, which only these, who were of such Repute in the Church were capable to effect. And in all this I have said nothing but what has been asserted by the most approved Divines especially in their Writings against the Romanists. Yea the most judicious & learned Bishop *Usher* (q) is of the same mind: *Altho'* (saith he) *it be undeniable that the first Successors of the Apostles excell'd in Piety and Holiness, it's certain notwithstanding that they neither attained to the Virtue nor simplicity of Doctrine that were in their Ancestors and Teachers as is well observed by Nicephorus.* And now judge if D. M's. Romish Querie, whether the Ecclesiastical Government could be changed from Parity to Prelacy (as is pretended) in those early Ages of the Church, especially since some Apostles and several Apostolical Men surviv'd the Period, fixt by some Presbyterians, (but no Presbyterian did ever yeeld that this Change was made during the Life of any of the Apostles) for the beginning of this (pretended) Change; and if the Change was in it self impossible, then Prelacy must needs be acknowledged Apostolical. I therefore turn my Assertion into a Conclusion, and from what is said with confidence Inferred, that the Antiquity even of the true *Ignatius* was not able to secure him from all Lapses and Mistakes, and that in his time some Churches, not only might, but actually were itching after several Novelities.

(q) De Christianarum Ecclesiarum successione et statu. Page 19. *Et si enim qui proximè Apostolis successerunt, Pietate cum primis & Sanctitate excelluisse negari non potest: certum tamen est, neque eorum qui præcesserunt, virtutem asscutos, neque ita simplicem, ut Magistrorum, orationem consecutos esse, quemadmodum restè à Nicephoro notatum est.*



## Section IV.

*The third Hypothesis ; that there is no real Disagreement, but a true Concord betwixt the Doctrine of Ignatius and that of the present Presbyterians.*

**I** Now come to the third Hypothesis, and assert that *Ignatius* is not so clear and positive in the Matter of Episcopacy, as to denude Presbyterians of all rational Defence, should they acquiesce in his Judgement; and therein join with their Antagonists who still appeal to his Determination. For all he speaks of *Presbyters* as distinguished from *Bishops* may well be mean'd of these who are call'd *Ruling Elders*, and that there was such an Office in the primitive Church is made evident by what is commonly brought from *Origen*, *Tertullian*, *Optatus*, the *African Code*, and *Augustine*, frequently distinguishing them from preaching Presbyters. And *Purpurinus* expressly terms them *Ecclesiasticos Viros*, *Ecclesiastick Men*: In vain therefore object *Petavius* and others that these were only Church-Wardens not properly Ecclesiastics. And indeed the Ancients not only tell us there was such an Office, but also plainly assert that, through pride and haughtiness of the Church Doctors, this Custom was abolished, as *Ambrose*, or rather *Hilary* sufficiently witnesses. *The Synagogue* (saith he (a)) and afterward the Church, had Elders, without whose Counsel nothing was to be done in the Church; which, by what negligence was abolished, I know not, except perchance it were through the sloth, or rather the pride of the Church-Doctors, while they desired to carry all the esteem their alone.

§. 2. Doctor *Field* tells us (b) That these were not Lay-Elders. Neither, as they themselves well know, do we so term them: but did as the Ancients reckon them among the Ecclesiastics.

And we assert, that these very *Lay-Elders* (as he calls them) are under-

(a) Com. In. Ep. prior. ad Tim. Cap. 5. Unde & Synagoga & postea Ecclesia seniores habuit quorum sine Consilio nihil agebatur in Ecclesia. Quod quia negligentia obsoleverit, nescio, nisi forte Doctorum desidia, aut magis superbia dum soli volunt aliquid videri. (b) *Field* on the Church. Book 5. Cap. 26.

stood

Sect. 4. *examin'd and disprov'd.*

135

stood by *Hilary*. For first, this Practice of the Christian Church is by *Hilary* deduced from the Synagogue, wherein there were Elders distinct from the *Doctors* or *Pastors*. Secondly, He attributes to the *Elders*, as their Office, only the Power of Consulting and Deciding, as being Assessors to the *Doctors* in the management of Church-Affairs, without intimating ought of their Power to dispense the Word and Sacraments. Thirdly, He expressly distinguishes them from all *Doctors* or *Teachers* of the Church, and therefore excludes them from all Power of Preaching, or Administration of the Sacraments. But *Doctor Field* saith that, *Ambrose* by the name of *Teachers*, whose sloth and pride he condemneth in this place, mightfully understand the *Bishop*, seeing none but *Bishops* have Power to preach in their own Right, and others but only by Permission from them. But this Answer supposes that the time was when *Bishop*, *Teacher* and *Doctor*, were reciprocal Terms, and that whoever had the Charge of never so small a Flock was the *Bishop* thereof: for who can believe, that ever any receiv'd the Charge of a Flock, to whom he was only to preach, and dispense the Sacraments as a Journey-man to another? Lastly, When *Hilary* speaks in the preterit Tense that the Church had such, tells that their Office consisted in being Assessors to the *Teachers*, and says that the use of these was laid aside, he clearly intimates that the *Elders* he speaks of, were well nigh abolished, and then scarce in Being Which by no means can be said of the preaching *Presbyters*. For let *Bishops* be not only as proud as *Dr. Field* would have them, but even as *Lucifer* himself, yet most certain it is that long after *Hilary's* time, the *Bishops* in all weighty Affairs used, at least, to consult the *Presbyters*, and that both then and still afterward, preaching *Presbyters* were existent. But herein I will not enlarge. See their Glosses of both Scriptures & Fathers, whereby we vouch this Matter removed, to name no others, by *Didonius* (c), to which I find nothing replied. This clear Proof that there were in the primitive Church other *Elders*, distinct from those preaching *Presbyters*, who in the time of the Apostles, not much distant from that of *Ignatius*, were dignifi'd with the name of *Bishop*, furnisheth us with an Answer sufficient alone to solve whatsoever they can deduce from these Epistles. Their only Argument is that *Ignatius* distinguishes between *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, why then by *Bishop* may we not understand a Pastor of one Congregation, and under the name of *Presbyter* a Ruling Elder? They can only repon that *Ignatius* mentions but

one Bishop of any City he wrote to, which yet required more than one Pastor. But one Man may be called the Bishop or Pastor of such a place, altho' he be placed in a Colledge; where a Plurality equally participats of the pastoral Charge and Honour: and that this Answer may please them the better, I shall give them *Ignatius* for my Patron herein; who, writing to the *Romans*, expressly termeth himself (d) *Bishop of Syria*, to whose Charge, even our Adversaries being Judges, *Antioch* (only) one City thereof, was committed. 'Tis moreover certain and granted by our Adversaries, that there was even in one City frequently a Plurality of Bishops. But tho' 'twere yeilded that neither Scripture nor Antiquity favour these Ruling Elders, and therefore that these *Ignatian* Presbyters must be something else, we are yet where we were.

§. 3. Our inquiry is after a Diocesan Bishop, we're sent to *Ignatius* to find him, but all, after the strickest search, we meet with, is only a Bishop or Pastor of one single Congregation as these ensuing Places proclaim.

*Let none* (saith he (e)) *do any of these things that ought to be practised in the Church without the Bishop, let that Worship be counted Lawfull that is performed by him; or which he (at least) has permitted, wheresoever the Bishop is, there let also the Multitude be present, even as where Christ is, there is also the Church: it is not lawfull either to Baptize or Celebrate the Lord's Supper without the Bishop, but whatsoever he alloweth, that is acceptable to God, that whatsoever is done may be established.* From which Passage it's evident that *Ignatius* supposes and allowes one of these Bishops to each particular Flock or Congregation; without whose Presence the Word and Sacraments were not to be dispensed: and altho' he adds that in some Case his Allowance or Approbation did warrant the practising thereof; yet I'm sure none can Infer any thing therefrom except that at some rare times, when the Bishop happen'd to be absent from his particular Flock (which uses to fall out to every particular Pastor) another approved by him might, untill his return to his Congregation, discharge his Office. And again (f) *Let there be* (saith he) *frequent Gatherings of your selves together or Congregations. Inquire thou* (Speaking to *Polycarp* Bishop of *Smyrna*) *or seek after every Man by his Name, neglect*

(d) ὅτι τὸν ἐπίσκοπον Συρίας καθέλωσεν ἔτος. (e) Ep. ad Smyrnatos. Μὴδὲς γὰρ ἡ ἐκκλησία τὴν π. αὐτοῦ — ὅτι ἐὰν καθὼν ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, ἐκεῖ τὸ πᾶντος ἔστι ἔτος. (f) Ad Polycarpum — ἐξ ὀνόματος πάντας ζητεῖ, δούλος καὶ δούλος καὶ ὑπερηφάνει.

neither

*neither servants nor hand-maids.* From whence it's clear, that this *Ignatian Bishop* was particularly to be acquainted with, and have particular Inspection of every one who was under his Charge; which I'm sure cannot be easily performed by a Diocesan Bishop; but is proper only to a Pastor of a particular Congregation: or who can forbear to conclude as much from another Passage of the same Author, where he saith (g) *whosoever is not within the Altar is deprived of the Bread of God, for if the Prayers of one or two have so much efficacy, of how much weight must these be that are put up by the Bishop and the whole Church.* Sure I am, the genius and ayr of this Passage, proclaims *Ignatius* speaking of such a Bishop or Pastor, as is under a Tye reciprocal between him and one particular Flock or Congregation. And again (h) *In obedience to the Bishop, break-Bread, which is the Medicine of Immortality.* Neither is he a greater Friend to Diocesan Prelacy, while he admonisheth the Church of *Philadelphia* in these words (i) *Children of the Light and of the Truth, fly Divisions and Corrupt Doctrines, and wherever the Pastor (viz. the Bishop) is, thither you as Sheep follow him.* And again (k) *One Fle<sup>s</sup>h of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one Cup in the Union of his Blood, one Altar and one Bishop.* Add to all this, that *Ignatius* every where in these Epistles, speaks to, and of the Bishop; as a correlative of, and with respect unto the People or Flock, and not Presbyters or inferiour Pastors, as the proper Object of his Episcopal Office. Seeing then all the Pastors of any Church he writes to, might equally be term'd Bishop or Pastor of such a place; seeing whatsoever he saith to or of Bishops, hath a particular reference to the Flock or People; and seeing, finally, so many things spoken by *Ignatius* of these Bishops, can agree only to Congregational Pastors; I conclude, that by these *Ignatian Bishops*, not Diocesan Prelats, but Pastors of particular Flocks, not only may but of necessity must be understood. And it's further observable that Preaching, Visiting of particular Persons and the rest of the Pastoral Work is either injoin'd unto, or clearly intimated to belong to the Bishop only, but nothing to the Presbyters, save sitting in Council with him. Now if our Opposites insist on their contrary Argument from the largeness of the Cities, and from this that *Ignatius* still speaks but of one Bishop therein, and

(g) *Ad Ephesios.* ἵνα μὴ τις ἢ ἐντὸς τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου ᾖ. (h) *Ibidem.* οὐκ ἔστιν ἄλλος πλὴν τοῦ ἐπισκόπου. (i) *Ad Philadelphios.* τὴν αὐτὴν ἡμῶν, ἀλλήλους φερόμεν τὴν μὲν σελήνην. (k) *Ibidem.* μισὰ γὰρ σὺν τῷ Κυρίῳ ᾖ.

hence conclude that he must be Diocesan; the result of all must be a sharper Conflict between Ignatius and himself, and so a fuller proof of the spuriousness of these Epistles, it being evident from what is adduc'd that this Bishop was only a Pastor of a single Congregation, yea so evident that it hath puzzl'd the learn'dest of our Opposites.

§. 4. Of this mind is *Joseph Mede*. (1) For speaking of these Ignatian Epistles, *It should seem* (saith he) *that in these first times before Dioceses were divided into those lesser and subordinate Churches, we now call Parishes, and Presbyters assigned to them*) they had not only one Altar in one Church, or Dominicum, but one Altar to a Church, taking Church for the Company or Corporation of the Faithfull, united under one Bishop or Pastor; and that was in the City and Place where the Bishop had his See and Residence: like as the Jews had but one Altar and one Temple for the whole Nation united under one High-Priest. And yet, as the Jews had their Synagogues, so perhaps might they have more Oratories than one, tho' their Altar were but one; there namely where the Bishop was. On Sunday (saith Justin Martyr) all that live in Towns or in the Country meet together in one Place; namely, as he there tells us, to celebrate and participate the Holy Eucharist. Why was this, but because they had not many places to celebrate in? And unless this were so, whence came it else that a schismatical Bishop was said to set up another Altar; and that a Bishop and an Altar are made Correlatives? See St. Cyprian Ep. 40. 72. 73. *Et de unitate Ecclesie*. And thus perhaps is Ignatius also to be understood in that forequoted Passage of his, *Εἰς ὅσον ὁ ἱερεὺς* &c. Where 'tis clear that Mr. *Mede* well perceived the thing we now plead for in Ignatius, viz. that this Bishop was only the Pastor of a single Flock. Indeed fear to offend his Friends, or something else, made him say so little as he could, and something that he ought not to have said while he would parallel this Altar with that of the Jews: yet he's express enough that all subject to the Bishop met in one place for Participation of the Sacraments, and consequently for hearing of the Word; and moreover really acknowledgeth that Dioceses then were only what Parishes are now, and if so, tho' they had other Oratories 'tis nothing to the purpose of our Opposites, which yet his (perhaps) proves him afraid to assert. For he knew well enough, that, seeing, as he grants, all under his Charge took their Communion with the Bishop at his Church, which, as every one knows, was then Celebrated (at least) every Lord's day,

(1) Proof for Churches in the second Century. Pages 28, 29.

any

any other Oratories for publick Worship had been altogether unnecessary; with which superfluities the Church in these early and tempestuous days was not at all acquainted. In vain therefore Dr. *Maurice*, (m) that he may at once abuse both *Mede* and *Ignatius*, tells us that Altar in the primitive sense signified not only the Communion Table but the whole Place where the Chair of the Bishop and the Seats of the Presbyters were placed: and in this sense there was but one Altar in one Diocese, as there is now but one Consistory, as is clear from *Ignatius* and *Usher*. And to be in one Altar, which is *Ignatius* his Phrase is only to be in Communion with the Bishop. And this Dr. *Maurice* would have to be *Mede*'s meaning thereof. But the fallshood of this is not only evident from *Ignatius*, who all along (as we have seen) reciprocates his Bishop with the Pastor of a particular Flock, but also from *Mede*'s express words, as we have already observed from them. I pass as scarce good sense Dr. *Maurice* his saying that Altar not only signified the Communion Table, but the whole place of the Bishop's Chair &c. The Dispute not being what place or thing in a Church, Altar signifi'd, but if thereby in *Ignatius* one or more places for publick Worship be meant: yea this my sense of *Ignatius*, Doctor *Wake* (n) seems to grant, while he says, speaking of these *Ignatian* times, that none officiated but either the Bishop himself or he who was appointed or allow'd by him, and that they had in every such Place of their Assembling, one Table, or Altar at which they performed this Service. We have heard already *Mede* rightly observing out of *Ignatius*, that the Altar or Communion Table was (only) at the Bishop's Residence, and where he officiated. And we see from Dr. *Wake* that in every place of solemn Worship they had an Altar or Communion Table. The Conclusion then is, which we also already heard *Mede* acknowledging, that there were then no fewer Bishops than Places of publick Worship, which is the Truth, and what we conclude from *Ignatius*.

And to these add the words of one who is neither unskillfull in these Matters, nor yet Partial in favours of Presbytry. In the beginning (saith he (o)) the Bishops whole Charge was called *μεγιστια*, and by the strain of *Ignatius* his Epistles, especially that to *Smyrna*, it would appear, that there was but one Church, at least but one Place, where there was one Altar and Communion in each of these Parishes, for he saith, there was one Bishop, one Church and one

(m) Defence of Diocesan Episcopacy. Pag. 37. and 38. (n) Genuine Epistles of the Apostolick Fathers. Pages 183, 184. (o) Dr. *Burnet* on the 1. and 2. of the Apost. can. Page 51.



140 *The Fundamentals of the Hierarchy* Part. II.  
*Altar.* And now judge of the Symphony of this Assertion, with the Principles of the Author, or how he could averr [p] *that if these Epistles be Genuine the Cause of Presbytry will be undone.* But of all things most strange and unaccountable is Dr. Pearson's Conduct in the Dispute, who with indefatigable pains and vast learning wrote his Defence of *Ignatius* to the end (as he pretends) he might well nigh infallibly establish a Diocesan Bishop; and yet has proved so far from hitting the white at which he ultimately levell'd, that on supposition of the sufficiency of his *Vindicia*, he most sufficiently demonstrates the Identity of Bishop and parochial Pastor during the time of *Ignatius*, and thus unavoidably ruins what he most earnestly intended to repair. And now behold the vast Fabrick and Engine wherewith they threaten the utter Ruine of Presbytry turning upon and shattering to pieces their Diocesan Hierarchy.

----- *Nec enim Lex justior ulla,*

*Quam necis Artifices arte petite sua.*

(p) Confer. Page 314.

---

## Section V.

*The Objections they pretend to bring from Scripture against the Doctrine now deduc'd from Ignatius, removed.*

AND indeed *Ignatius* is encompass'd with so thick a Cloud of Witnesses, who, not only deny all support to, but give most evident Depositions against the *Diocesan Prelat*, that his Testimony in favours thereof should be a firm demonstration of the Bastardy of these Epistles. The time of the Apostles was not far above that of *Ignatius*. Now, if we consult these, we shall not only find our Adversaries destitute of their Suffrages, but also overwhelm'd with their plain Testimonies against the *Hierarchy*.

'Tis true they alledge several things out of the Apostolick Writings, for establishing their Cause; as that *Timothy* and *Titus*, as also the *Angels* of the *Asiatick Churches* were *Diocesan Bishops*. The grounds wherein they establish the *Episcopacy* of *Timothy* and *Titus*, are, *that they are enjoined to Ordain Elders which in after Ages was the peculiar Province of Diocesan*

*san*

Seet. 5. *examin'd and disprov'd.*

141

*san Bishops; and that in the Postscripts of these Epistles they are both called Bishops* But their later Topick is by the profound silence of the ancient Commentaries and many other tokens of Forgery and Novelty so baffl'd that Prelacy's present Agents, and amongst others D. M., are so wise as to suppress it. And yet D. M. (a) adventures to conclude *Timothy his being made Bishop of Ephesus from Acts 20. 3, 4, 5.* (which Inference few, I think, beside the Author can gather) compared with *1 Tim. 1. 3. I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus-----that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other Doctrine.* From which even tho' it be compared with the other Scripture, any Man in his Wit would much rather, with *Chrysostome*, infer the very contrary, and conclude that *Timothy's stay at Ephesus* was only temporary, to expedite the Business there mention'd but not to fix therein. But, saith he (b) *1 Tim. 3. 14. 15. These things I write unto thee &c. plainly insinuat his particular Relation to the Church of Ephesus.* But the many Scriptures informing us of *Timothy's* almost perpetual absence from *Ephesus*; perswade that there was no such Relation, neither does this place in the least insinuat it, but only that *Timothy* if not sent for was to stay till *Paul's* return, wherefore he begs the Question while (c) he tells us that *after he was in a particular manner established Bishop of the Church of Ephesus he might wait upon Paul.* Moreover this was an odd Attendance that scarce ever suffer'd *Timothy* to stay with his Flock, and this shift, too like that of the Romanists, who, in Answer to the Argument from Scripture-silence against *Peter's* being Bishop of *Rome*, tell us that he was frequently abroad. But here we have not only Scripture-silence but Scripture Testimony, shewing *Timothy's* almost perpetual absence from *Ephesus*. He essays also (d) to bring *Timothy's* Episcopal Power and particular Relation to *Ephesus* from *1 Tim. 5. 9. 1 Tim. 2. 1. and 1 Tim. 5. 21.* And that this was not temporary or transient, but successive and perpetual, he would prove (e) from *1 Tim. 6. 13. 20. and 2 Tim. 2. 2.* and adds that his Adversaries grant that the Power he pleads for to Bishops was exercised by *Timothy*. But as for the particular Relation he speaks of, he should have proved it, seeing he knows it will not be granted, except he bring more than the bare recitall of the places from which his fancy collects it, and without such a particular Relation the Power *Timothy* exercised, be what

(a) Pages 106. 107. (b) Page 108. (c) Page 107. (d) Page 108. (e) Pages 109.

it will, makes nothing for his purpose: seeing it might be lodged in him alone as an Evangelist, and thus most of his *postulata* (f) prove useless. Yet I will handle them particularly, of which the first two are, *that the Power which Timothy exercised was in it self lawfull, and that he practised it in Ephesus.* And 'tis true none denies it, but what then, untill he first prove *Timothy's* particular Relation to the Church of *Ephesus.* The third and fourth are, *that it was committed to him alone, and not to a Colledge of Presbyters acting among themselves in Parity.* And that there's no mention of any spiritual Power lodged in a Colledge of Presbyters to which Timothy was accountable. But Willet, an approved Divine of the Church of England, shall answer for us; *Neither* (saith he (g)) *can it be gathered by these words of the Apostle, lay Hands suddenly upon no Man &c. That Timothy had this sole Power in himself, for the Apostle would not give that to him which he did not take to himself, who associated unto him the rest of the Presbytry in Ordaining of Timothy.* I add that there's no less mention of a spiritual Power in a Colledge of Presbyters &c. than of Timothy's being fixed Bishop of *Ephesus.* Hence his 5. *postulatum* (viz. *That the great and most eminent Branches of the Episcopal Power were lodged in Timothy's Person, the ordination of such as were admitted unto the sacred Function, the care of Widows, the Censuring of Elders, and his autoritative preventing of Heresies*) becomes unserviceable. His VI is, *that this Authority was not in it self of temporary duration, transient, or extraordinary, but such as the constant Necessities of the Church do make necessary in all Ages; for he was commanded to commit it unto faithful Men, such as should be able to teach others, and if there be nothing in it extraordinary, why do they say that in the discharging of an ordinary trust, there was need of an extraordinary Officer.*

But First he corrupts the Apostles words 2 Tim. 2. 2. substituting (it) in stead of (them) that thereby he may force the Text to speak of a Power equal to that of Timothy, which was to be derived unto succeeding Teachers, when yet it plainly speaks of the Transmission of the Doctrine or things Timothy had heard, and others were to teach; but nothing of an equality of Timothy's Power to be derived in *solidum* to every subsequent Bishop or Teacher. Now except this be proved, D. M. saith nothing. Yea Hammond (h) expressly contradicts him, *Appoint them* (saith he) *as Bishops under thee.* Moreover, Christ committed the things Paul here speaks of to his Apostles; yet

[f] Pages 109, 110. (g) Syn. pap. contr. 5. Quest. 3. (h) *In locum.*  
will

Se<sup>ct</sup>. 5. *examin'd and disprov'd.*

143

will D. M. say their Power was equal to Christ's?

*Secondly*, In this his last *postulatum* there appears a strange kind of reasoning viz. the Things or Actions wherein *Timothy* and *Titus* were employed, are perpetual and ordinary; therefore they were not extraordinary Officers: just as if one would Reason: It's ordinary for a skillfull Physician to relieve a Febricitant; therefore our Saviour relieving *Peter's Wife's Mother*, was no extraordinary Physician. For their Method and Way of performing these Actions was extraordinary and temporary, they having no special Power over, or Relation to, any one particular Congregation; but such a Power and Relation as equally were extended over all the places whither they were sent. Moreover others of their Actions, and these which were properly Evangelistick, were extraordinary: such as that of Planting the first Christian Churches.

*Lastly*, I appeal to all Protestants, if his ascribing to every Bishop a Power of *authorative preventing of Heresies* (i. e. a Power of making Canons that lean only on the Bishop's own Will, and which he's not oblig'd to prove from Scripture, otherwise every Minister of Christ hath a Power and Authority, by publick preaching and reasoning from the Word of God, to prevent and overthrow Heresies: and so D. M. speaks not to the purpose) hath not a rank favour of what is no better than the grossest of Popery. The Romanists give such an authoritative Power to one Pope, but from a perswasion of his Infallibility: this Author will have it unto every single Bishop, tho', as yet, he has not adventured to ascribe to each of 'em such a Priviledge, and to explain, if need were, what he means by this *authorative preventing of Heresies*.

§. 2. Look but on page 95 *et seq.* and you shall see him make every Bishop an Apostle in the strictest sense, and priviledg'd with no less Power over the Church-Officers and People in his Diocess than an Apostle ever had or could exercise: viz. a Power to Govern the Churches, to give Rules and Directions, to inflict Censures, to communicate his Authority to others, to hear Complaints, to decide Controversies ----- to Confer the Holy Ghost ----- viz. the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, that must needs attend the authoritative Ministry of holy Things; and therefore that the Office of an Apostle is altogether ordinary and permanent. The Apostolical Office (saith he) being essentially no other than this, the ordinary Necessities of the Church require that it should continue till the second coming of our Saviour. But the extraordi-

nary

*nary Gifts of the Holy Ghost, the Power of Miracles, of Languages----- were only extrinſick Advantages, -----and not peculiar to the Apoſtles. And to affirm otherways; and ſay that the proper Apoſtolick Office is now ceaſed, he makes proper to Presbyterians and Socinians. But ſo far is he from ſpeaking Truth here, that the ceaſing of the proper Apoſtolick Office and Power is aſſerted by the Body of Proteſtants, even Episcopals noleſs than Presbyterian, in oppoſition to the Jeſuites his Maſters, who, as he doth to his Dioceſan Biſhop, arrogate an Apoſtolick Office and Power to their Pope. Spanhem F. (i) a fervent Apologet of the Hierarchicks, aſſigns many Characters of the Apoſtolate as an extraordinary Calling either immediat or equivalent thereto, infallibility of Doctrine, transcendent Efficacy and energy in Preaching, admirable ſucceſs therein, the Gift of Tongues, and of working Miracles: all which things, altho' ſome of 'em might have been in ſome meaſure in others, were (ſaith he) in a more Divine and Eminent manner in the Apoſtles. And he affirms that every one who was endued with a true and proper Apoſtolick Power, had, and could give ſuch viſible Proofs and ocular Demonſtrations thereof: and then concludes againſt the Pope; thus, (k) let the Pope now deſcend from the Capitol, let him, as did the Apoſtles, declare that he has the Gift of Tongues Divinely infused, let him bring viſibly the Gifts of the Holy Ghost from Heav'n, let him work like the Apoſtles ſuch illuſtrious Miracles, and then we ſhall yeeld that he has Apoſtolick Authority: and ſo ſhall we to the Dioceſans when they adduce theſe Proofs of their Apoſtleſhip. He aſſerts (l) that they're much deceiv'd who would bring the Apoſtles down to the Order of particular Biſhops; and demonſtrats againſt Hammond, that they were not at all call'd Apoſtles on the account that they were Biſhops, & conſequently that Apoſtle and Biſhop are quite different things. (m) In ſhort the very Sum and Subſtance of Spanhemius his Diſputation is nothing ſave an Approbation and Confirmation of that common Sentiment of Proteſtants expreſs'd by Beza (n) The Churches (ſaith he) being once conſtitute, this Office of the Apoſtle-ſhip was of neceſſity taken away: he is a Tyrant therefore who does now profeſs himſelf an Apoſtle in the Church by Succeſſion. And by*

(i) Diſſert. 3. Numb. 25. Et ſeq. (k) Numb. 27. Eat nunc de rupe turpeia Pontifex, & cum Apoſtoliſ ſiquatur Linguis Sp. S. celis viſibiliter arceſſat, virtutes ſimiles edat, magnalia eadem obſignet, ac venerabimur in eo Apoſtolatus Apicem! (l) Numb. 34. (m) Numb. 17. (n) In Epiſt. ad Ephesios. Cap. 4. ver. 11. Conſtitutis ergo his hinc quoque munus neceſſario fuit ſublatus: itaque tyrannica hodie vox eſt in Eccleſia ſeſe Apoſtolum ex Succeſſione profiteri.

this

this one Observation, viz. that whereever the proper Apostolick Power was, they could give ocular and undeniable Proofs and Demonstrations thereof, the Protestants for ever silence and baffle the Jesuites and their Progeny D. M. and such Companions ascribing a Power properly Apostolick to their Roman Antichrist and their Diocesan Prelats, and fully remove all their Quibbles on this Theme, as Dr. Scot's Quirk, the Substance whereof is, *there's no mention in Scripture of the taking away of this Apostolick Office; and therefore it yet remains.* But I forgot that for the permanency of a Power properly Apostolick D. M. cites Mat. 28. 20. *And lo I am with you alway, even unto the end of the World.* As if, not to mention Protestants, (o) even the more ingenuous Romanists, as *Lyra*, did not understand this place, of Christ's assistance given to all Doctors of the Church without any Discrimination. Moreover all his Exceptions and pretended Instances to the contrary are impertinent, and severals of 'em false in matter of Fact, as for Example, *nor is it necessary* (saith D. M.) *to make up an Apostle that he be immediately call'd to the Apostolate by our Saviour; for Matthias----- was not immediately ordain'd by our Saviour, but by the Apostles.* But *Spanhemius* (p) tells these Jesuites that the *Lot* that fell upon Matthias was really the voice of God, *no less than was that of the Division of Canaan, of the Scape-goat &c.* And indeed, as I said, that the Office and Power properly Apostolick is long since ceas'd, is the common Doctrine of Protestants; as *Calvine* (q). *None* (saith *Sadeel* (r) against *Turrian* the Jesuite) *but he who is an Ignoramus in Divinity will confound an Apostle with a Bishop----- I assert therefore that God's immediat calling and choosing to preach the Gospel is essential to the Office of an Apostle.* But these, say you, were Presbyterians. I deny't not; however, they were then pleading the common Cause of Protestants, and were never opposed herein by any save down-right Papists only, till that now we have to do with real Jesuites, who yet mask themselves, and will not acknowledge the name. In the mean while I do not think they'll say *Spanhemius Fil.* is a Presbyterian, nor yet *Nilus Bishop of Thessalonica* who saith (s) *the Pope is not an Apostle, the Apostles*

(o) Vide, inter alios, Marloratum in locum. (p) Numb. 27. De Matthias sorte, id est divina voce, qualiter in distributione terra, in segregatione Hirci &c. (q) Vide Instit. Lib. 4. Cap. 3. (r) Et nemo sane, nisi plane sit ad hoc vocatus, Apostolatum confuderit. — dico igitur immediate eligi & vocari a Deo ad predicandum Evangelium, esse essentiale Ministerio Apostolatus. (s) De primatu Papæ. Lib. 2. Pag. 303. 1. οὗ Πάπας, οὗ ἀποστόλους, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἀποστόλους, ἀλλ' οὗ ποιμένας δικαιοσύνης καὶ σωτῆρος ἐκκλησίας.



did not ordain other Apostles, but only Doctors and Teachers. Of this mind is also Willet (t). Bellarmine [saith Whitaker (u)] seems to say the Pope succeeds Peter in his Apostle-ship ----- but none can have Apostolick Power but he who is properly and truly an Apostle; for the Power and Office of an Apostle constitute an Apostle. But that the Pope is neither truly nor properly an Apostle is prov'd by these Arguments whereby Paul proves his Apostle-ship, as, that he was not call'd by Men &c. Gal. 1. 1, and 12. and Ephes. 3. 3. and 5. 1 Cor. 9. 1. Altho' (saith Sauterius (x)) the ancient Bishop of Rome succeeded Peter in Doctrine and the Chair, yet they succeeded him not in his Apostle-ship, but the latter Bishops in neither &c. And Lightfoot (y) a renown'd Divine of the Church of England, proves that the Apostle-ship was an Order for ever unimutable in the Church. The Apostles (saith the same Author (z)) could not ordain an Apostle by Imposition of Hands, as they could ordain Elders; but they are forced to use a Divine Lot, which was as the immediate Hand of Christ imposed on him that was to be ordained: that Opinion took little notice of this circumstance, that hath placed Bishops in the Place of the Apostles, by a common and successive Ordination. Dr. Barrow, whose Works are publish'd by Bishop Tillotson, and therefore are to be lookt on as his, is copious on this Subject. Apostles also (saith he (a)) did Govern in an absolute manner, according to Discretion, as being guided by infallible assistance, to the which they might on occasion appeal, and affirm, it hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us. ----- Neither did the Apostles pretend to communicate it. They did indeed appoint standing Pastors and Teachers in each Church; they did assume fellow Labourers or Assistants in the Work of Preaching and Governance; but they did not constitute Apostles, equal to themselves in Authority, Privileges or Gifts, for who knoweth not (saith St. Austine) that Primate of Apostle-ship to be preferr'd before any Episcopacy? And the Bishops (saith Bellarmine) have no part of the true Apostolical Authority. And now judge of the Spirit of these Men, who are glad most falsly to brand these famous Bishops, and others the most eminent Doctors of that Perswasion as being guilty of the most abominable Crime of Socinianism, providing they can there-

(t) Page 145. (u) De pontif. Romano. Page 61. *Qua igitur in re — in Apostolatu videtur dicere Bellarminus — At Apostolicam potestatem nemo habere potest, nisi qui verè ac propriè Apostolus est &c.* [x] De pontif. Rom. Pages 175, 176. *Quare etiam olim Episcopi R. Petro successerint in Dicitina, & externa Cathedra, non tamen in Apostolatu, etsi successerunt, at posteriores Pontifices nec &c.* [y] Vol. 1. Page 787. (z) Page 745. [a] Of the Pope's Supremacy. Page 78.

by bespatter and make odious the Presbyterians. Judge also of D. M's Query (b) *whether the Apostolical Power, as to it's permanent, necessary, and essential Branches, was not in its nature Perpetual and Successive; and by them transmitted in solidum, as they receiv'd it from our blessed Saviour to single Successors in particular Sees, and not to a Colledge of Presbyters in the modern Notion?* As to the last part of his Query and his Presbyters in the modern Notion, I know none such if 't be not these of the Hierarchicks their half Ministers, for which there is no ground in Scripture. And accordingly it's certain that the Apostles left the managing of the Church to neither Bishops nor Presbyters in his sense, both of them being *Chimera's* but to Colledges of Bishops who are also Presbyters, both being one in Scripture & during the Apostolick age. But tho' we should grant them all the Query seeks, supposing, which all the Ancients affirm, the equality of all Bishops who, at the beginning, were reciprocated with Congregations, he's yet but where he was, and has really done nothing for the establishing of his Hierarchy. Judge lastly, of that doughty Argument of the Papiests (c) and our Hierarchicks for Prelacy: to wit, *that Bishops succeed to the Apostles and Presbyters to the 70 Disciples:* which has been generally reckon'd, by Protestants, among *Rome's* dotages, and as such refuted in their Popish Controversies; and, to name no others, by Junius (d) and Willet (e) who answers that not only Bishops, but all faithfull Pastors are the Apostles Successors: and that, even according to the Pope's Decrees, not Bishops, but Priests, succeed the Apostles; and Deacons, not Presbyters, succeed the 70 Disciples. And now, to go on with D. M. and his Fellows, all their cavilling to make Timothy and Titus Hierarchick Bishops, is but the product of a late Popish Dream. For the Fathers, when they so called them, or the Apostles, mean'd not of Bishops in this sense.

§. 3. Wherefore Willet (f) Answers that it is most like Timothy had the Place and Calling of an Evangelist: and that the Calling of Evangelists and Bishops which were Pastors was diverse. This Answer which so approv'd a Divine of the Church of England gave the Papiests, D. M. (g) calls a ridiculous subterfuge. For (saith he) the Work of an Evangelist has nothing in it opposite to, or inconsistent with, the Dignity of a Bishop &c. A most

(b) Page 158. (c) *Alphonfus de Castro adversus hæreses.* Fol. 102. Bellarm. de Clericis. Cap. 14. (d) Tom. 2. Col. 1209. (e) Synopf. papism. Page 236. (f) Ibidem. (g) Page 111.

disingenuous tergiversation and sliding from the Office of the opponent or probant to that of the defendant, seeing this was one of his special Scripture-Arguments whereby to establish his Hierarchy; and it's sure that if *Timothy* and *Titus* might do what they did under another Notion and Capacity than that of a Diocesan Prelate, his Argument goes to wrack. As does also his perversion of *2 Tim. 4 5*, for he insinuates that from *Timothy's* being enjoined to do the Work of an Evangelist, it will no more follow that he deserved the Name than *Daniel's* saying *Ch. 8. 27*. that he did the King's Work, will prove him a King. But had he ever considered the rest of the Epistle, the context of the place, and the Signification and Notation of the Word *Evangelist*, he had clearly seen that the Apostle so adapts this Work of an Evangelist to *Timothy*, that the Name and Character properly belongs unto him. He adds (b) *That any who now convert Jews or Pagans are as properly Evangelists as any so called in the primitive Church*; and thus insinuates that Evangelists, such as *Timothy* and *Titus*, were no extraordinary Officers, which, except a few Novelists wedded to their Fancies, is condemned by all Men.

§. 4. And that there was such a Function by which some in the days of the Apostles were raised far above the rank of ordinar Pastors or Doctors, and placed in the very next degree to the Apostles themselves, whose Office was mostly ambulatory, going from Church to Church in the exercise thereof, is in part intimated by *Sedulius* and *Theodoret* and others upon *Ephes. 4. 11*. but more fully by *Eusebius* (1) who informs us 'that even after the Death of the Apostles divers remained who were 'in a far higher rank than the rest of their Successors, who being (saith 'he) the admirable and divine Disciples of so great Men built up the 'Churches the Apostles had founded, promoting the preaching of the 'Gospel, and sowing Seed of the Kingdom of Heaven far and wide 'thro' the whole World: for many of these Disciples that were yet living, whose Minds the Divine Word had inflamed with a vehement 'desire of Wisdom, fulfilling our Saviour's Command and dividing 'their Goods among the Poor and thus leaving their Country, exercised the Office of Evangelists among these who had not yet heard the

(b) Page 112. (f) Lib. 3. Cap. 37. καὶ ἄλλοι δὲ ἐπὶ πύτεις πένες ἐκ-  
νοήσαντο καὶ τὰς δεξιὰς τὴν πρώτην λαβὴν τῆς τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἐπιχορηγίας διὰ τοῦ  
ἐπιταῖς ἀποδημίας στείλοντο, ἔργον ἐπιτελεῖν ἐναγγελιστῶν — ποιμένας τε καὶ δι-  
καστὰς ἑτέρας — ἑτέρας αὐτοὶ πάλιν χώρας τε καὶ ἔθνη κατήσαν — ἐπὶ καὶ τῷ  
δοῦναι πένεσιν ὅτι εἰς τὸ τοῦ δι' αὐτοῦ πληροῦν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου διδάσκειν ἐπὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν.

'Doctrine

• Doctrine of Faith by most diligent preaching of the Gospel and furnishing their Hearers with the Holy Scriptures: these, so soon as in any remot and barbarous Country they had laid the Foundations of Faith and ordained Pastors, and had committed to these Pastors the care of this New Plantation, being content therewith and accompanied by the Grace and Power of God hast'ned to other Countries; for even to that time the Divine Power of God's Spirit wrought Miracles by these Men, so that at the first hearing of the Gospel some whole Peoples readily imbraced the Christian Religion. Behold Reader how plainly and fully *Eusebius* relates the thing we plead for viz. that those Officers were altogether extraordinary unfixed and temporary.

§. 5. Wretch'dly therefore does D. M. (k) castrate this full and plain discourse, while he only says that an Evangelist, in the Notion of *Eusebius*, was a Person that preached the Gospel to those that had not heard of it or resisted it; and thus dissembles the whole matter in question which *Eusebius* clearly determines.

And according to this Relation of *Eusebius*, 2 Timothy 4. 5. he is enjoined to do the Work of an Evangelist, and never made a long stay at one place for even after the time of his pretended Ordination to the Bishoprick, we find him not rarely with the Apostle *Paul* as his Attendant or Fellow Labourer: which not only his joint Supercriptions to the second Epistle to the *Corinthians* and these to the *Philippians*, *Colossians*, both his Epistles to the *Thessalonians*, and to *Philemon*: but also the long Journeys and Peregrinations wherein we find *Timothy* still employed, irrefragably make manifest: for after he is supposed to have been Bishop of *Ephesus*, he was accompanying *Paul* in his Voyages *Acts* 20. 4. and was with him Prisoner at *Rome* as is probable from *Philippians* 1. and 1. *Heb.* 13. 23. as also frequently employed in long Voyages to several Churches, and that in Businesses which could not be expedited in a day as is evident 1 *Cor.* 4. 17. 1 *Cor.* 16. 10. *Philip.* 2. 19. *Heb.* 13. 23. 2 *Tim.* 4. 21. So that if he was Bishop of *Ephesus* he will prove a sufficient Pattern for non-residence. Most of which things may be supposed of *Titus*, whose frequent long Journeys are mentioned by the same Apostle. Yea they have just as good ground in 2 *Tim.* 4. 10. to fix *Titus* his Episcopal Chair in *Dalmatia*, which was the Fancy of *Aquinas* (l) and others as, they can ever shew for their dream of its being among

(k) Page 111. (l) In locum. *Titus etiam missus ab eo abiit in Dalmatiam, ubi finaliter fuisse Episcopus dicitur.*

the Cretians. And indeed the very Phrase from which they gather the Prelacy of *Titus* (as we have already observed of *Timothy*) gives real ground to conclude the contrary: For this Cause (saith he) I left thee in Crete that thou shouldest set in Order the things that are wanting and ordain Elders. From which place any ingenuous Man shall be compell'd to infer, that *Titus* was only left there to supply some present want, and to return again, much rather than that he was the fixed Arch-Bishop of Crete.

§. 6. It's amazing then that in defiance of so clear Antiquity, yea and so clear and full Scripture evidence, some dare to transform *Timothy* and *Titus* unto ordinary and fixed Officers; why? they see that among the ordinary and fixed Church-Officers they cannot find what they covet, the Scriptures making *Bishop*, *Pastor*, and *Presbyter* one and the same, but yeelding no place to their *Diocesan Bishop*, a Lord and Ruler over other Bishops or Pastors. They are compell'd therefore, in imitation of the Romanists, who degrade the Apostle to find the Bishop of *Rome* and *Antioch*, just so to handle the Evangelists that *Peter* be not alone, but may find other degraded Companions if he shall by chance, in his Journey from one of his Sees to another, visit *Crete* or *Epheesus*.

§. 7. But more strange is that most precarious Assertion of D. M. (1) that Philip the Evangelist had no Power of Ordination. But it's yet more admirable how, to establish *Timothy* a Bishop, he can adduce (m) the eleventh Act of the Council of Chalcedon: surely, had he read the learned *Stillingfleet* (n) who hath for ever baffl'd them in this their Allegation, he had blush'd at the very mentioning thereof. And we learn from *Hierome* (o) that *Titus*, after he had given some Instruction to the Churches of Crete, was to return again to the Apostles, and to be succeeded by *Artemas* or *Tychicus*, for comforting of these Churches in the absence of the Apostle. Judge Reader if *Hierome* thought *Titus* was fix'd Arch-Bishop of Crete. It's questionable (saith *Chrysostome* (p)) if the Apostle had then constituted *Timothy* Bishop there: for he saith, that thou might'st charge some that they teach no other Doctrine. Thus he, without a word more for solution of this his Doubt. Judge therefore if, from the very

(1) Page 112. (m) Page 107. (n) Irem. Pages 302, 303. (o) Proem. in Tit. Scribit ad Titum &c. (p) Hom. 1. in 1 Tim. ἀξιον ὃς ἐπιστάς, ἐν τῷ ἐκείνου ἐκείναι τὸν πᾶντον, οἱ γὰρ ἱερεῖς παρὰ γέλης ποὶ μὴ ἐπὶ ἐκείνου ἀλλ' αὐτῷ.

Scripture, whereon (alone) they would found *Timothy's* being Bishop of Ephesus, he really concludes not the quite contrary Doctrine. It's doubtfull (saith a most earnest Prelatist, *Salmeron* the Jesuit [q]) if *Timothy* was Bishop of Ephesus, for altho' he preach'd and ordain'd some to the Ministry there, it follows not that he was the Bishop of that place, for *Paul* preach'd also there above two years, and absolv'd the Penitents, and yet he was no Bishop. Add that now and then the Apostle call'd him away unto himself and sent him from Rome to the Hebrews with his Epistle. And in the second Epistle he commands him to come to him shortly. *Timothy* was also an Evangelist of that Order Eph. 4. He gave some Apostles &c. So that *Dorotheus* says in his Synopsis, that *Timothy* preach'd through all Greece but he stay'd at Ephesus not to be Bishop, but that in the constitute Church of Ephesus he might oppose the false Apostles &c. It appears therefore that he was more than a Bishop, altho' for a time he preach'd in that City as a Pastor and ordain'd some to the Ministry. Hence it is that some call him Bishop of Ephesus. And to conclude this matter, the celebrated *Stillingfleet* (r) ingenuously grants that *Timothy* and *Titus* were no fixed Bishops or Pastors but Evangelists, notwithstanding [saith he] all the opposition made against it, as will appear to any who will take an impartial survey of the Arguments on both sides.

§. 8. As for the Apocalyptick Angels, tho' with *Beza*, we should affirm that by one of 'em one single Moderator is mean'd, we yeeld them nothing, but, *contra*, cut the sinews of their Argument. With this D. M. [s] ingages not; only he calls the Alterableness of the Moderator, which *Beza* holds as defensible, ridiculous, which is said without proof, and tho' it were so, touches not the marrow of our Answer. But they shall find their Foundation yet weaker for such a structure, so soon as they shall with attention read over the contexts of the place now in Controversie. The seven Stars which are the seven Angels are said to be held in God's right hand; whereby, without peradventure, is signified the great care our Lord had of the Pastors of these Flocks, in order to the promoting of the great Gospel-Design, the gaining of Souls to himself. But Bishops, I mean Diocesans, as such, and distinct from other Pastors, are not at all Dispensers of the Word and Sacraments, by whom mostly this Gospel-design is effected.

t. Moreover, how few should they be, to whom this care was extend-

(q) Disp. 1. in 1 Tim. *Dubium est an Episcopus fuerit Ephesus &c.* (r) Iren. Page 340. (s) Page 117.



ed, and how small comfort should the bulk of the Labourers in the Word and Doctrine be able to reap from the Scripture; which other-ways is one of the most refreshing Cordials to the weary and fainting Labourers of Christ's Vineyard. And if we consult the Epistles to these Churches, how many things shall we find therein that argue, beyond scruple, that the Spirit is speaking to the collective Bodies of Church-Officers and not to one Man only. Shall we believe that for the sin of one Diocesan Bishop, who, as such, was scarce so much as a Preacher of the Gospel, all the Candlesticks of the Gospel were to be removed from the whole Church, and the Light thereof extinguished: a grievous Punishment, and too universal, providing the Diocesan only were to be charged with Defection. Yea have we not much better reason, to judge that this declining, and deserting of their first Love, imputed to the *Ephesian Angel*, had crept into, at least, the far greater part of the Church-Officers; and so the sin charged upon them, and the punishment threatned shall have a far greater correspondency. Moreover the trial of false Teachers, for which the same *Ephesian Angel* is commended, is not the Work of any one Church-Officer, but of the Ecclesiastical Senat, which therefore must be the Angel, who upon this account is here commended. *D. M.* yeelds that the Heavenly Admonitions first address'd to these Angels were also communicated to the Churches but by the interposel of their Angels. But, were this as certain as, from what is now said, it appears precarious, yea and incredible; yet this Angel or Bishop might be only a *Præses* or Moderator, so his Argument is not at all relieved. *Who* (continues he) *can't be call'd a Colledge of Angels but one single Angel &c.* Which is a most flat begging of the Question. *And tho'* (saith he) *there be Instructions in these Epistles, in which, besides others, the Angels are particularly admonished, yet they are no less adress'd to single Angels than the Epistle to the Philippians is to that Church, Tho' St. Paul uses particular Compellations Co. 4. verse 2. 3.* Where he perverts the state of the Question which is not, *If in any Epistle there may be Instructions that concern some beside these to whom they are chiefly directed?* But if what is here said to the Angel can agree to any one Man? And beside what is instanced, to what one Man in the World can that agree which is promised to the *Philadelphian Angel*? viz. *That the Hereticks were to come and Worship before his Feet.* Such a promise indeed is made to the Church, *Isai. 60. 14.* but to one meer Man no where.

§. 9 From all which 'tis evident that by the Name of Angels, not particular Men, but at least the Ecclesiastick Senats are design'd which is not unfrequent in Scripture, as *Mal. 2. 7.* where 'tis said that the *Priests lips should keep knowledge*, from whose mouth the Law was to be sought, the reason of which is subjoin'd, that he was the *Messenger* or *Angel* &c. as the *Seventy* have it. I know from the Passage Dr. *Hammond*, on the Revelation, attempts to conclude the quite contrary, alledging that in this place the *High-Priest* only is to be understood, but without any ground of his alledgiance: this his Assertion further supposes, that the *High-Priest* alone was the Cabine of Knowledge, and the Peoples Teacher from whom the Law was to be learned; quite contrary to 2 *Chron. 17. 8, 9.* where we learn that amongst the rest of the Teachers sent through the Kingdom by *Jehoshaphat*, were *Elishamma* and *Jehoram* Priests. Moreover the 4, 5, and 6. verses of the same second of *Malachy*, where under the name of *Levi* in the singular Number all the Levites are undeniably to be understood, and what's said of *Levi* as of one Man is certainly mean'd of a Multitude; evince that under the name of *Priest* in the following verse, we must understand a Plurality.

§. 10. But the 24. verse of the second Chapter, *Unto you I say and to the rest of Thyatira* puts this beyond Debate. But *Hammond* excepts, that in the Ancient Greek Mss. And particularly that at St. *James* is left out, and the words read *To you the rest* or *To the rest of you in Thyatira*. But be it so, yet I think these will not serve to discredit the Vulgar, and universally received Greek Copy in which this particle is found. Yea 'tis found in so many Greek Copies, and these of so good Note, that I doubt if any of all these who during eight or nine Score of years, translated or expounded this Place, has omitted it; and altho' some Copies of the Vulgar Latine want it; yet there be no few that retain it; and amongst others two Mss. in the Library of *Glasgow*. And *Arctas* or rather *Andreas* who lived in the fifth Century; above, as I believe, the age of most of the Mss. now in the World, I except not that at St. *James*'s notwithstanding of what is sabled to the contrary, retains this Particle as a part of the then uncontroverted Copy. And after him *Beda*: to which we may yet add the ablest of the Romanists, as *Dionysius Cartusians*, *Lyra* the *Glossa interlinearis*, and a *Lapide*, no Friends to Presbytry.

§. 11. But D. *M.* (t) tells us that these words in the 24 v. But unto you I say, &c. cannot be applied so properly to the Angel of the Church of Thyatira as to these mention'd in the end of the 23 verse, the other Churches of Asia. Which, (saith he) because they are mentioned in the Speech directed to the Angel of the Church of Thyatira the immediate transition from him to them is easie.

But except we force the place nothing of this kind can be thence collected, there being nothing in this Epistle spoken to or of the other Churches except the meer mentioning thereof, the more to hold forth the greatness and conspicuousness of the Punishment denounced against the Strayers in Thyatira. Yea the latter part of the 24 verse, *And to the rest in Thyatira* proclaims that the former part of the verse is to be understood of the same People of Thyatira likewise. In a word his gloss is so uncouth and strain'd that you cannot easily tell what to make of it, And 'tis, at least, no more odd than his Conduct all along.

§. 12. And to instance, in the present Theme, he would fain ridicule *Salmasius* for affirming that, under the names of the Angels, the Churches themselves or the more pure and Angel-like parts thereof are to be understood. According to *Salmasius* his Interpretation (infers D. *M.*) the seven Stars must needs be the seven Churches of the seven Churches. As if such Phrases were not frequent enough in Authors, and yet not justly lyable to any such Inference; or as if the more holy and spiritual part of the Church were the whole visible Church: for except D. *M.* so affirm, the Author of this Gloss can't be accus'd of nonsense; who yet is not *Salmasius*, for he only learn'd it from *Aretas*, or *Andraas*, and other Fathers, and defended it against the Jesuite *Petavius*, whom D. *M.* would patronize against both Protestants and Fathers.

The second of the Homilies ascribed to *Augustine* (u) in *Apocalypsin* informs us that under the name of Angel not only Bishops but other Church-Rulers are likewise understood. And again, seeing Angel signifies a Messenger; whosoever, whether Bishop, Presbyter or Laick frequently speaketh of God, and declares how we may obtain eternal Life, deservedly gets the name of an Angel of God. And *Aretas* (x) saith, he calleth the Church

(t) Page 117. (u) Et Angeli eorum ibidem non debent intelli, nisi aut Episcopi aut praepositi Ecclesiarum.— Nam quia etiam Angelus nuncius interpretatur, quicumque aut Episcopus aut Presbyter aut etiam Laicus frequenter de Deo loquitur, & quomodo ad Vitam eternam perveniat meritis Angelus Dei dicitur. (x) Comment. in Apocalypf. Cap. 3. Ἀγγέλων τῆς Ἐκκλησίας τὴν αὐτὴν ἐκκλησίαν λέγουσιν.

Sect. 5.

examin'd and disprov'd.

155

is self the Angel. And *Primasius* (y) saith by these Angels of the Church are to be understood the Guides and Rectors of the People, who ruling in particular Churches, Preach the Word of Life to all Men: for the name of Angel signifies a Messenger. And (z) again both Church and Angel is comprehended under the Person of the Angel. And thus their main Scripture-Argument even the Fathers being Judges goes to ruine.

§. 13. Yea the more sagacious of our Adversaries well perceive that neither this Scripture, nor any other, supports their Doctrine: Wherefore *Petavius* never attempts to bring his Proofs from Scripture, but only from Ecclesiastick Traditions. Add hereto the words of Dr. *Burnet* (a) As for the Notion (saith he) of the distinct Offices of Bishop and Presbyter, I confess, it is not so clear to me: and therefore since I look upon the Sacramental Actions, as the highest of sacred Performances; I cannot but acknowledge these who are empower'd for them, must be of the highest Office in the Church. So I do not alledge a Bishop to be a distinct Office from a Presbyter; but a different degree in the same Office, to whom for Order and Unties sake, the chief inspection and care of Ecclesiastical Matters ought to be referred, and who shall have Authority to curb the Insolencies of some factious and turbulent Spirits. His Work should be to feed the Flock by the Word and Sacraments, as well as other Presbyters; and especially to try and ordain Entrants, and to Oversee, Direct, and Admonish such as bear Office. And I more willingly incline to believe Bishops and Presbyters, to be the several degrees of the same Office, since the names of Bishop and Presbyter, are used for the same thing in Scripture; and are also used promiscuously by the Writers of the two first Centuries. Where he plainly contradicts Dr. *Pearson*, who, in favour of his *Ignatius*, largely pleads for the accurat distinction of Bishop and Presbyter in the second Century, denies Bishop and Presbyter to be distinct Orders; and finally acknowledges, that in the chiefeft parts of the Ministerial Function they are equal: and so really denudes the Bishop of all the degree he left him. But more clearly elsewhere, 'I acknowledged (saith he (b)) Bishop and Presbyter, to be one and the same Office; and so I plead for no New Office-Bearers in the Church. Next, in our second Conference, the Power giv'n to Churchmen was proved to be double. The first Branch of it, is their Authority to publish the Gospel, to manage the Worship, and to dispence

(y) In Cap. 1. Apoc. (z) In Cap. 2. (a) Confer. Page 310.

[b] Confer. Page 331.

X 2

'the

'the Sacraments. And this is all that is of Divine-Right in the Ministry, in which Bishops and Presbyters are equal sharers, both being vested with this Power. But beside this, the Church claims a Power of Jurisdiction, of making Rules for Discipline, and of appointing and executing the same; all which is indeed suitable to the common Laws of Societies, and to the general Rules of Scripture, but hath no positive Warrant from any Scripture-Precept. And all these Constitutions of Churches into Synods and the Canons of Discipline, taking their rise from the Divisions of the World into the several Provinces, and beginning in the end of the second, and beginning of the third Century, do clearly shew they can be derived from no Divine Original; and so were, as to their particular Form, but of humane Constitution: therefore as to the management of this Jurisdiction, it is in the Churches Power to cast it in what mould she will. *A Presbyter (acknowledges even Cornelius à Lapide (c)) is equal to a Bishop in the chiefest Order, which is the Order of the Priest-hood.*

§. 14. To which add the Judgement of Dr. Hammond a Man so dissenting with extreme Passion for the Hierarchy, that he makes (d) him that sat on the Throne Rev. 4. God the Father, and the four and twenty Elders with their Golden Crowns, an Image and Representation of the Metropolitan Bishop of Hierusalem, and the four and twenty Bishops of Judæa in Council, for Golden Crowns or Mitres he makes the Characters of the Episcopal Dignity. Yet even he asserts (on Acts 11.30. & Philip. 1.1.) that the Title of Presbyter in Scripture times belonged principally if not only to Bishops: There being (saith he) no evidence that any of that second Order were then instituted but Bishops (only) and Deacons. This he at large confirms, and so really overthrows Prelacy when he would faintest establish it, joining with the Presbyterians in their grand Antiprelatick Principle; viz. that simple Presbyter (as the Hierarchicks phrase it) without Power of Ordination or Government, or a distinction between Bishop and preaching Presbyter, is a meer stranger, & without all Foundation in the Holy Scriptures. From all which 'tis clear that these Bishops or (which is all one) preaching Presbyters, in Scriptures, and during the Apostolick age, were nothing save Pastors of particular Congregations.

(c) In Philip. 1. 1. (d) On Rev. 4. compared with his Notes on Acts 11.

Section

## Section VI.

*Our meaning of Ignatius confirmed from the Writings of the Apostles, his immediat Ancestors*

**M**oreover nothing can be more clear for the Identity of Bishop and preaching Presbyter, than that known Scripture Acts 20. 17, 28. They Answer, *that the Bishops of Asia, not the Pastors of Ephesus, were, by Paul, sent for, which some would support from the 18 ver. From the first day that I came into Asia &c.* But since, as is clear *ch. 19. verse 10.* from his coming into *Asia*, he had been most in *Ephesus*, he might truly say so much tho' the *Ephesians* only had been present; but suppose he spoke to others beside, we are at no loss; the Question is, if he gave not, tho' amongst others, the Title of Overseers or Bishops to these he sent for? *verse 17.* And if these were not the Elders of *Ephesus*? They yet object the words of *Irenaeus* viz. *That Paul called together to Miletum the Bishops and Presbyters of Ephesus and the neighbouring Towns.* But as for his seeming here to distinguish Bishops from Presbyters, this Scripture where they get both Names, and which *Irenaeus* had then in his view, and his frequent promiscuous using of these Names, perswade me that he only respected the 17 and 28 verses, and so took *Bishop* and *Presbyter* Synonymically for one and the same. His adding of *the neighbour Towns to Ephesus* might flow from his inadvertency whereat no attentive Reader of *Irenaeus* (a) will marvel, and yet this is as likely to have crept into the Version, for the Original of *Irenaeus* we have not, because these Elders their belonging to *Ephesus* alone is not only so clear from the 17 verse, that the repeating of the word *Ephesus* would really prove a redundancy, wherefore the *Syriack* omits it in the former part of the verse and expresses it in the latter, and called for the Elders of the Church of *Ephesus*: but also all the Ancients either affirm, as *Hierome*, or suppose that these Elders belonged only to *Ephesus*, which even Dr. *Maurice* (b) yields against Dr. *Hammond* and says, *that then, properly speaking, there might not*

(a) Lib. 2. Cap. 4. (b) Pages 31, 32.



be a Bishop amongst them all, for they are Presbyters belonging not to several Congregations; but to one Church and might have a Bishop. But not only the promiscuous attributing to them the Names Bishop and Presbyter, their being, and that without any insinuation of their Subjection to a superiour Bishop, enjoin'd by the Apostle to Oversee and feed the Flock; and finally the very Repetition of this Fiction of their Hierarchy in the Apostolick Age sufficiently refute it. *Who* (continues he) *the Ancients thought was Timothy*. And thus all resolves into the fictitious Episcopacy of *Timothy*, already overthrown. Now 'tis observable how they contradict one another, and by halves acknowledge to be false all they plead for: for some, as Dr. *Maurice*, perceiving that the Ancients affirm and the Scriptures proclaim all these Elders to belong to the Church or City of *Ephesus*, acknowledge these could be no Diocesan Bishops. Others as Dr. *Hammond* (in locum & alibi) and *Petavius* (c) seeing that these are not only dignifi'd with the name of Bishop but intrusted with the care of the Flock, and that without Paul's mentioning of any superiour Bishop; when, if ever, there was ground to have mention'd him; yeeld that, of necessity, these Elders must be Bishops or more than simple Presbyters. Whence is all this Contradiction and Confusion of Tongues? but from the force of Truth before which Men must either bow or break, and be compell'd, tho' after never so much interpolation and disguise, to express what they would fainest conceal. The matter is, their Diocesan Bishop, their simple Presbyter, their distinction between Bishop and Presbyter are meer Antiscriptural Figments, in the sustaining of which against this and the like Scriptures, they are obliged to confront one another, and in the throng of their blunderings intirely yeeld the Controversie.

§. 2. The same line of confusion runs along their Answer to Philip. 1. 1. with the Bishops and Deacons &c. whence 'tis clear that there were in one City many Bishops who were no other thing than Presbyters, and that these were no distinct Orders, the Deacons being immediatly subjoin'd, these were the Bishops of the several Cities of *Macedonia* under *Philippi* the Metropolis (saith Dr. *Hammond* in locum) 'tis denied by Dr. *Maurice* (d) I could never find reason (saith he) to believe them any other thing than Presbyters. *Philippi* was a Metropolis because a Colonie; saith Dr. *Hammond*: but that this will not follow is acknowledged by Dr. *Maurice*. Thus they are still by the ears. But saith Dr. *Hammond*, she

(c) Apud Wal. Mefs. Page 96. (d) Page 27.

*Apostle*

*Apostle might retain the Episcopal Power in his own hands, and tho' absent might exercise it by Letters: but they can give no ground why the like may not be said of the Apostle in reference to the rest of the Churches, and so Timothy and Titus shall be dethron'd and our Adversaries, endeavouring to Answer one of our Arguments, los's two of their own, yea all of them: for it being no less presumable that John would keep the Episcopal Power over the Churches of Asia in his own hand then that Paul kept that of Philippi, there shall be no ground nor colour to Metamorphose the Apocalyptick Angels into Diocesan Bishops? Or it's possible (continues Dr. H.) that then the Bishop's Chair was vacant. But if so and a Diocesan so necessary as they pretend, without peradventure the Apostle had not only mention'd it. but also spent some part of his Epistle in directing and giving them Rules in order to their choice of a fit Successour. Or the Bishop (saith he) might be absent, and Epaphroditus by the Ancients judg'd Bishop of Philippi appears to have been then with Paul. But this Dream of Epaphroditus his being Bishop of Philippi, the Doctor in that very place (\*) condemns and overthrows, and so frees us of further trouble about it.*

§. 3. Yea in none of these Answers does Dr. H. rest, but, as is said, in this pretext that Philippi was a Metropolis over many subject Bishops, leaning mainly on Acts 16. 12. whose Arguments were examined by Dr. Stillingfleet (f) and Mr. Clerkson. (g) Dr. Maurice, tho' a grand Enemy to Hammond's grand Principle, undertakes notwithstanding the defence of some of these Arguments against the latter, but meddles not with the former, and saith that Beza's Manuscript hath *κεφαλῇ* and not *πρωτῇ* as hath also the Syriack and Arabick. But OEcumenius and Theophylact, and even Chrysostome, yea and the received Greek Copy which Translators, generally follow, read *πρωτῇ* not *κεφαλῇ*. But seeing, as the learned Stillingfleet demonstrates, Philippi was not then a Metropolis in the Civil sence which is the Foundation of all their Structure, 'tis impossible that it can be call'd by Luke *πρωτῇ* or first in respect of Dignity; but only either must be mean'd as Luke may well be understood that it was the first Colony they sett with coming from Samothrace, or in respect of Situation it being scarce within the Bounds of the proper Macedonia, but on the Thracian side of the River Strymon the Boundary

(\*) Page 636. (f) Ir. Page 359. Et seq. (g) Prim. Episc. Page 7. Et seq.

between *Thrace* and *Macedonia*, yet it might be nearer to the proper *Macedonia* than was *Neapolis*, and therefore is rather to be reckon'd a part of that Country than *Neapolis* could be: wherefore on both, at least, certainly on one of these accounts, appears the nullity of Dr. *Maurice* his Answer, while he says that not *Philippi* but *Neapolis* was the first in Situation. Of the same kidney is his saying that *Philippi* might be more considerable in *Luke's* time than in the time of *P. Æmilius*: seeing this is a mean begging of the Question: for he brings nothing from any Records which a Matter of this kind requires, to make in the least probable the growth of *Philippi* between the time of *Æmilius* and *Luke*: and *Chrysostome* (*b*) speaking of *Luke's* time, tells us that it was no great City. Moreover Dr. *Stillingfleet*, ex abundanti, clearly shews through the several periods of time that *Philippi* was of no greater Dignity in the time of *Luke* than in the time of *P. Æmilius*. Dr. *Maurice* adds as a proof of *Philippi's* Metropolitan-ship, in *Luke's* time that the Bishop of *Philippi* is mention'd as Metropolitan in *Liberatus*, the Council of *Ephesus*, *Sedulius*, and in an old Notitia. To which I Answer with Dr. *Stillingfleet* (*i*) in the like Case: But what validity there is in such Subscriptions, or Allegations in the latter end of the fourth, or the time of the fifth Century to prove a Metropolis: in the first, let anyone judge that doth but consider how common a thing it was to alter Metropoles, especially after the new Disposition of the Roman Empire by *Constantine*. Yea *Carolus à sancto Paulo* who was most versant in these Matters, and with him Dr. *Stillingfleet*, believe that for the first six Centuries *Philippi* was no Metropolis.

§. 4. But I will not enlarge in overthrowing a Fancy so wild and gross. But in the end of the second Century, (saith Dr. *Burnet*, (*k*)) the Churches were framed in another mould from the Division of the Empire: and the Bishops of the Cities did, according to the several Divisions of the Empire, associat in Synods with the chief Bishop of that Division or Province, who was call'd the Metropolitan, from the Dignity of the City, where he was Bishop. And hence sprang Provincial Synods, and the Superiorities, and Precedencies of Bishopricks. You see how the chiefest of Prelatists disown and disclaim this Metropolitan Fiction: but none more fully than Dr. *Stillingfleet* who has nervously baffl'd all their Pretences, prevented whatsoever Dr. *Maurice* advanced (for I speak not of Mr.

(*b*) Homil. 35. In Act. Apost.  $\chi\epsilon\ \delta\epsilon\ \eta\ \pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\ \alpha\gamma\alpha\lambda\eta\ \eta\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\eta\ \epsilon\iota\lambda\iota\pi\tau\alpha\iota$ .  
 (*i*) Iren. Page 361. (*k*) Conferences. Pages 307, 308.

Clerkson who has also sufficiently done it) and finally, more particularly, ruined all their Pretexes for *Philippi's* Metropolitanship, either in a Civil or Ecclesiastick sense, during the first Century or Apostolick age. Judge therefore of Dr. *Mantise* his Candor, which minds me of another piece of his *Legerdemain* to evite the force of *Philippians* 1. 1. For if (saith he (1)) in *Mr. Clerkson's Opinion*, the Bishops mention'd *Philip. 1. 1.* be no other than Presbyters, then this place is impertinently alledged, since many Presbyters are by all sides acknowledg'd to have belong'd to one Church, but if he speak of Bishops in the common Ecclesiastical sense, and then conclude from this Passage that there were many in the Church of *Philippi*, his Opinion is as singular as that of Dr. Hammond which he endeavours to refute, for my part I must profess I am not concern'd in this Dispute; and I could never find reason to believe them any other thing, than Presbyters ----- (m) Or were these Bishops only Presbyters ruling the Church of *Philippi*, with common and equal Authority? Then our Author must give up the Question, and instead of making many Bishops, must own that there was none at all there, but Presbyters only, if he thus contend he will abuse his Reader with the ambiguity of a word, which he takes in one sense, and the Church in another. That many Presbyters might belong to one Congregation, none ever deni'd; that many Bishops in the allowed and Ecclesiastical sense of the word, had the oversight of one City, sounds strange and incredible to the ancient Christians. Where he sleely supposes as granted that Bishops in *Philip. 1. 1.* must either be understood of their simple Presbyters or of Diocesan Bishops, and then equipp's his horn'd Argument no other ways than if he had professedly declined all Dispute, till once his Adversary had, out of kindness, yeilded the Question, which is only about the Scriptural and Apostolick sense of the word and notion of the Office of a Bishop, if that, and the Office of a preaching Presbyter be not in Scripture one and the same, and consequently if these at *Philippi* were not Scriptural Bishops no less than they were Presbyters? Now that he concern'd not himself in this Dispute, nor was in earnest in it I deny not: his slippery dealings make it but too, too apparent: his simple intimation that these were only their simple Presbyters, I pass, having already blown off all their noticeable Depravations of *Philip. 1. 1.* I have yet mett with; and observe that he, following the Romanists, insinuates that we can't understand the Scripture's meaning, untill we have their Churches Commentary. His ambiguous and

unhandsome conduct is no less apparent in these his Phrases (*common Ecclesiastical sense*—which he takes in one sense, and the Church in another) For either he may mean that the Church, when she speaks of Bishops who were in after times, understands, by this Name, only Diocesans; and so touches not in the least (contrary to what he insinuates) the Churches received sense of this Text, nor what Notion she had of Scriptural-Bishops: Or his sense may be that, when she speaks of Apostolick and Scriptural Bishops, she then still means Diocesans and Rulers over their simple Presbyters, and this he must mean if he speak to the Purpose. And then I inquire what Church was of this mind? Surely neither Primitive nor reformed Churches, I except not that of *England*, whose greatest Lights we have already heard disclaiming all Divine Right of Diocesan Episcopacy, and identifying *Bishop* and *Presbyter*. Yea many, even of the Romanists, are forc'd to confess so much; *There are Catholics* (saith the Jesuite *Justinians* (n)) *who have stuck in the mud of Arianism*. The Church then he means must be only a few factious Novelists, who, in despite of both Divine and Humane Records, and the common Sentiment of Christians, dare to obtrude on the World, as a Fundamental of Religion, their privat and wild Fancies. Neither is it strange that so few embrace this conceit of denying the Scripture-Identity of Bishop and Presbyter.

§. 5. For beside these Scriptures now adduc'd let them but look unto *1 Tim.* 1. 3. where they shall find a transition from Bishop to Deacons without any mention of intermediant Presbyters, and consequently the Identity of these Offices. *Bellarmino* (o) Answers "that the Apostle gives a general Instruction to the Clergy, & that under the name of Bishops & Presbyters all the superior Clergy is comprehended. But seeing they make a Distinction of these Offices so necessary, it was requisite they had been handl'd in particular, and not huddl'd up in a general, seeing no where in Scripture there's any more particular Distinction of Bishop and preaching Presbyter assigned: but *Bellarmino*'s main Answer to this and all such Scriptures is, *that the Names Bishop and Presbyter were then common to both Orders*: which Answer all the Hierarchicks and more particularly D. *M.* borrow from the Jesuite. But I answer and argue with *Junius* against *Bellarmino* (p) *that seeing the Names were then*

(n) In Philip. 1. 1. *Hæserunt in eodem Luto nonnulli Catholici.* (o) *De Clericis.* Cap. 15. (p) *Tom.* 2. Col. 1211.

common, and a real community of Names imparts a community of things which by these names are signifi'd; it necessarily then follows that, as the Names were then common, so were the Offices design'd by these Names. But to see the Reform'd conquering, and the Jesuites foil'd some are much pain'd: and in special D. M. who spends about 17 pages (q) for the support of Bellarmine's Answer: the substance whereof, and of his first three *Queries* (r) is, that Still in the Pentateuch the High Priest is nam'd by the same Appellative (without any distinction of Order or Jurisdiction) that the other Priests were nam'd by: and the title of a Priest was promiscuously apply'd, without any distinction or marks of Eminence to the High Priest as well as to the Subordinat. And, The Apostles retain'd the Phraseology of the Jews who spoke of Priests and Levites as two distinct Orders, without mentioning the High Priest. And, When the Ancients Dichotomiz'd the Clergy, they in other places plainly reckon up three distinct Orders of Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon. But is there never in all the Scriptures any Title, Distinction, or Marks of Eminence giv'n to one Priest, which were not communicable to all of 'em? Got ever all of 'em promiscuously the Title of High Priest, or such distinctive Appellations? Did the Apostles so retain the Phraseology of the Jews, as that they sometimes make a Bipartite and sometimes a Tripartite Division of ordinary Church-Officers, and give to any one ordinary Pastor, sometimes at least, a distinguishing Title and Marks of Eminence which are at no time communicable to all ordinary Pastors promiscuously? As to the Ancients their sometimes Dichotomizing, sometimes Trichotomizing the Clergy; it's most certain that in their Dichotomies they ey'd the prime primitive Church, and in their Trichotomies their own times. But (Christ saith D. M.) is call'd an Apostle & a Bishop, the Apostles, Presbyters and Deacons. But was Christ so call'd an Apostle that he had no other peculiar titles or marks of Eminence, or that on the other hand the name Christ was giv'n promiscuously to all Apostles or ever giv'n to any of 'em? Lastly, was the Appellation of Apostle equally communicable to all Presbyters or ordinary Pastors, as to the twelve and some few else extraordinary Officers? All which he must swallow, else he gives no relief to his Friend Bellarmine. We Argue, that seeing to no ordinary Pastor is giv'n any peculiar Appellation, Character, or Description, but what is equally common to all, there must be an Equality and Parity amongst all of 'em; and this they can never get o-

(q) Page 22. Et seq. (r) Pages 157, 158.



ver. Moreover among the Evangelists, yea and among the Apostles, Officers superior to ordinary Pastors, the reformed Churches being Judges, there was a compleat Parity as was also among the Deacons their Inferiours: notwithstanding of all which the Hierarchicks must plead for certain Stories of Preheminence among the ordinary Pastors; in favours; whereof *ne gry quidem* they can bring from the Word of God the only Rule of Faith and Doctrine.

§. 6. Add hereto *Tu, chap. 1.* where we not only find the Apostle using indifferently and promiscuously the two words *Bishop* and *Elder*, but also he alledgeth the necessity of fit Qualifications in the one, to prove that the same are required in the other; *the Presbyters that were to be Ordain'd must be blameless &c.* because a Bishop must be so: wherein either we have an ocular Demonstration of the Identity of these two Officers, or else (which I abhor to think) the Apostles reasoning is more pitifull than the most equivocal Paralogism; their being not so much as a nominal Connexion betwixt the Antecedent and Consequent; and no less ridiculous than if one should reason that every Captain of a single Company must be able to guide and manage a whole Army, because such Qualifications are required in a General. Now, seeing these Scriptures already vindicated, to name no others, evidently declare that there was no such thing as a Diocesan Bishop, that there's a compleat Identity of Bishop and preaching Presbyter, and consequently a Parity of all ordinary Pastors, they of necessity condemn the Hierarchick and Diocesan Imparity: for I'm perswaded these who alledge that they find in Scripture a Distinction between these Offices, will judge that they may with reason enough conclude the Divine Right of Episcopacy. Hence judge of D. *M's* fifth Query (*f*) *where and in what places of Scripture the superiority and jurisdiction of one Priest above another is forbidden? And if it be not plainly forbidden, then the Fancy of a Jus Divinum in favours of Presbytry (such as is exclusive of all other Forms of Ecclesiastical Government) is groundless and chimerical.*

From all which I conclude that if the Ignatian Bishop and Presbyter must be understood in the Notion of our Adversaries, he then quite crosses the Apostles, & so his Doctrine is stark nought, or (which is a far more charitable Sentiment) his Epistles have suffer'd no small interpolation.

(*f*) pag. 158.

Section

## Section VII.

*The grand Objection, taken from the Commentaries of the Ancients, remov'd.*

**B**UT the Fathers, as our Adversaries pretend, glossing on these Texts, went quite cross to our Doctrine. To the Bishops and Deacons (saith Chrysostome (a)) What means that? What? was there a Plurality of Bishops in one City? Not at all: for at that time the Name was yet common, so that a Bishop was also nam'd a Deacon, that is a Servant. And adds, that both Timothy and Titus were Bishops. Of the same mind (say they) were Hilary, Epiphanius, Theodoret, OEcumenius and others: which harmonious Consent of Ancients can't but be the true meaning of the places in Controversie. But as these, and such Fathers confess, and their Works proclaim, they were, like others, subject to humane Weakness and Corruption, fell into compliance with the growing Errors, into immoderate heat, prevarication and self-repugnancy, and negligence to search for the Scriptures their meaning. How loudly sounded the debate concerning rebaptizing between Stephen and Cyprian, which tore almost the whole body of Christians into a pair of Factions? With what heat was it prosecuted? And, which is most lamentable, how pitifully was the truth on both hands deserted? For altho' it be commonly believ'd that Stephen only held the truth, and Cyprian and his fail'd, yet Stephen and the Romans did no less betray it: On the other extrem, while they asserted the sufficiency of Baptism, altho' administred by the grossest Hereticks and capital Enemies of the Fundamentals of Christianity. How great, both before and after that time, were the Contests about Easter? How scandalous were the Contests between Chrysostome, Epiphanius and Theophilus: and between Hystrome and Rufine. Not to name others, in all which it is apparent how little they believed one another, and how much many of 'em prevaricated in favours of their particular Fancies.

(a) On Philip. 1. 1.

Y 3

§ 2, But

§. 2. But their Contradictions to one another are less to be admired when we clearly perceive that one and the self same Author, either out of negligence or some other weakness, hath given us quite contrary Doctrines. *Justine Martyr*, which *Scultes* observes (b), in one place ascribes the whole Work of Regeneration to free Grace, and in another destroys what he had builded; and places free Will in the room thereof. And *Clemens Alexandrinus*, as the same *Scultes* observes (c) following *Justine Martyr* delivers the like inconsistencies about the same Theme: he sometimes ascribes our Salvation wholly to Faith, and again tells us that we may purchase it with the Treasure of our Works.

§. 3. Of the same kind are their polemick Discourses, wherein their study was much more directed to bespatre their Antagonists, and allure the vulgar Auditor, than solidly to support the Truth. I shall never believe that *Optatus* (d) believed himself, when he maintain'd that all the Menaces utter'd in the Old Testament against Tyre and her King had for their Object *Parmenianus* the schismatical Bishop of the Donatists, who lived at Carthage, that had once been a Tyrian Colony, but in the time of *Parmenianus* was inhabited by Romans who had either quite extirpated or expelled thence the whole Race of the Tyrians. With no less lightness, but more danger did *Justine Martyr* (e) long before *Optatus*, endeavour to perswade the Gentiles, that all Mankind were Partakers of Christ, because they were Partakers of Reason, and Christ is called ΛΟΓΟΣ which also signifies Reason. Where we see that *Justine* leans only on a pitifull Equivocation, the deceit of which could not be unknown to him who natively spoke Greek. Neither were *Origenes*, *Methodius*, and others, as *Hierome* witnesseth, more solide in their Writings. Yea *Hierome* himself distinguisheth between *Progymnasticks* and *Dogmaticks*, alledging that in the former of these a Disputant hath liberty to muster up many Arguments in which he hath no confidence.

§. 4. To these we may add both their Homilies and Expositions wherein it's not easily determined when they spoke their own minds, or when they gave us only Transcripts of others, to believe and defend which they held themselves but little obliged. Yea *Hierome* oftner

(b) Medull. Theol. Patrum. Vol. 1. Lib. 1. Cap. 17. (c) Lib. 5. Cap. 13. (d) Contra Parmenianum, Lib. 3. (e) Apologia ad Antonium pium Imp. τὸν Χριστὸν πρωτότερον τῶ Θεοῦ εἶναι ἐδιδάχθαι, καὶ περιλυσιώμεν λόγον ὄντα, οὐ πᾶν γὰρ ἄνθρωπος μετέχει καὶ οἱ μετὰ λόγου βιωσάντες, Χριστιανοὶ εἰσι.

than once tells us that it was the common Practice of the Writers of these times to give the Expositions of others, and yet conceal the names of the Authors, and so involve the Reader, and make him take for their judgement the things they never believ'd.

§. 5. If we search into the causes of so strange dealing, we have heard out of *Hierome* that one of 'em was meer sloath and neglect. See much more to this purpose in *Dallans de usu Patrum*. Another Cause, why they both spoke, wrote and practis'd otherways than they knew could be warrant'd by Scripture, was their unjustifiable Compliance with both *Jews* and *Pagans*; good perhaps intentionally being out of design the better to Proselyte them, but eventually proved as unhappy as its Practice was unwarrantable, and destitute of Scripture ground. Hence their *Deacons* were named *Levites*, their *Bishops* *Priests* and *High-Priests*, the *Lord's Table* the *Altar*, and the *Lord's Supper* a *Sacrifice*, and at length *Diocesan Bishops* and *Arch-Bishops* were instituted in imitation of the (f) *Pagan* *Flamines* and *Protoflamines*. Another Cause thereof, which especially takes place in their *Homiles* and *Expositions*, was the multitude of Alterations and Corruptions well grown before any of these *Homilies* and *Commentaries* we now enjoy were extant, these were too deeply rooted to be opposed; and therefore they believed themselves under a kind of necessity to accommodat their Comments and Declamations thereto, at least, so to temper and compose them that they should not thwart therewith. Of this sort of Conduct, we have a clear instance in *Augustine*, who sometimes commends and praises several unscriptural Ceremonies: But (g) elsewhere speaking his Mind more freely disapproves them as both unwarrantable and burdensome. He indeed there intimats that some things commonly observ'd throw the World tho' they were not written yet might be kept as having come from the *Apostles* or general Councils; such as was the Observation of the *Lord's Passion*, *Resurrection* and *Ascension*. But even this, as is most probable, he yielded out of humane Weakness and Fear to oppose the then prevailing Innovations: for, the needlessness of such preterscriptural Observations he evidently declares elsewhere (g) saying that all things which belong either to Faith and Manners are plainly contain'd in Scripture. From all which is clear, that we cannot at all be sure if the Fathers, Commenting on the places in hand, either knew

(f) Lombard. Lib. 4. Distinctione 24. M. (g) Epist. 118. (h) De Doctrina Christiana. Lib. 2. Cap. 9.

their true meaning, or if they did, sincerely gave us what themselves believed.

§. 6. And that in their Explications of these Texts, we have not their genuine Sentiments, is to me evident. First, because they gave such Reasons of their Exposition as the greatest Prelatists count stark nought. Thus *Bellarmino* (1) rejects and overturns the Grounds of every one of these Expositors in particular, except these of *Chrysostome* only, who yet hath nothing of any moment above the rest: for *Chrysostome* expounding *Philip. 1. 1.* alledges only in defence of his Exposition that the sole Title and Name of Bishop was common to both Orders: but this is refused by *Dr. Hammond* and others, and, as we shall hear, by *Chrysostome* himself. But the Jesuite intending to retain that Exposition, thought himself obliged to embrace some of their Defences, whereas in truth they themselves never believ'd them to be solide, but only the growing Corruptions being too strong to be opposed, and some of 'em having got an Episcopacy which was then creeping in, and which they, depending on the Churches Authority, thought they might retain, they believ'd that for the fashion they might so gloss the Scriptures whereby Episcopacy is wounded that the People should not perceive the unwarrantableness thereof. Secondly, The main ground common to all these Expositions why they expone any of these Texts as if they condemn'd not a Diocesan Bishop, is a sufficient evidence that they were far from being in earnest in their Glosses, for they still alledge that there behov'd to be a Bishop above these Bishops in *Philippi* whom *Paul* salutes, because there might not be Plurality of Bishops in one City. This Practice indeed was for the most part current in this time, tho' not universal, as we learn from (k) *Epiphanius*, informing us that even in these times there used to be a Plurality of Bishops in one City. Yet quite contrary to this Text which they either carelessly or timourously shuff'd. They judged (saith *Dr. Stillingfleet* (l)) the Practice of the Apostles by that of their own times; as is evident by *Theodore* and the rest of the Greek Commentators, assigning that as the reason why the Presbyters spoken of in the Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, were not Bishops in the sense of their Age, because they could be but one Bishop in a City. And *Petavius* (m) grants that many true Bishops were sometimes at once in one City. And (n) altho' the Episcopal Order be of Divine Right,

(1) De Clericis. Cap. 15. (k) De heresi Miletiana. (l) Iren. Page 317. (m) apud Wal. Meß. pag. 6. & 114. (n) Apud Salmas. apparat. ad libros de primatu. Page 23.

yet it's not of Divine Right that there should be only one Bishop in one City, this was only brought in by the Authority of the Church and Councils, and accordingly Hierome and Ambrose are so be understood. By what Law (saith (o) J. Taylor) Speaking of *Philippi* and that not as a *Metropolis* may there not be more Bishops than one in a proper sense in one *Dioceſs*? Where 'tis not unpleasant to hear so great a Prelatist by one Interrogation overthrowing the whole Episcopal Cause, and propugning the main Plea of the Presbyterians viz. that in *Philippi* alone there were many who had not only the power of dispensing the Word and Sacraments, but also of Ordination and Jurisdiction, and were every way Bishops in a proper sense. Thirdly, Some of these Expositors proclaim what we alledge for (p) *OEcumenius* who, like the rest intimats, as if in *Philippi* there had been a Bishop superior to the plurality of Bishops saluted by the Apostle. Yet on *Acts* 20. and 17. gives this Paraphrase. "Because many are ignorant of the Manner especially of the New Testament, whereby Bishops are call'd Presbyters and Presbyters Bishops. This much may be observed both from this place and from the Epistle to *Titus* and to the *Philippians*, and 1. to *Timothy*. From this place therefore of the *Acts* we may arrive at the certainty of this Matter. For thus it is written, from *Miletus* he sent and called the Elders of the Church, it is not said the Bishops. And afterwards he subjoins, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you Bishops to Feed or Rule the Church: and from the Epistle to *Titus*, that thou mightest appoint Elders in every City, as I ordain'd thee: and from the Epistle to the *Philippians*, to all that are at *Philippi* with Bishops and Deacons: and, as I believe, the same may be gather'd from the first to *Timothy*: If any Man (saith he) desires the Office of a Bishop, he desires a good Work; a Bishop therefore should be blameless. And shortly after, let not a Widow be taken into the number under threescore years (which the Transcriber of *OEcumenius* hath out of negligence inserted from the 5. Chap. and 9. ver. in stead of the 8. verse of the 3. Likewise let the Deacons be grave &c.) For thus is the Church Canon directing what manner of Man such an one viz. the Deacon ought to be. Thus far *OEcumenius*, and not a word more to this purpose, where, having really propos'd the now much toss'd Question, mustres up four of the chief Places from which the Identity of

(o) Episcopacy asserted. Page 132. (p) ἐπειδὴ λαμβάνει πῦρ πολλοὺς τὶ συνῆδεα, — σπουδαίον τὸ τοῦ ἐπισκοπῆ, καὶ ἐν τῷ πρὸς τὶτον ἐπιστολῆς, ἐπ' ᾧ καὶ πρὸς Τιμόθεον πρώτης ἑστ.



Bishop and Presbyter is commonly inferr'd, and directs us to learn the Solution of this Doubt therefrom. Hence 'tis certain that *OEcumenius*, no less than *Hierome* and *Aërius* of old, and Presbyterians now, believ'd the Scriptural Identity of *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, seeing, he having brought up these Scriptures, which, even in the Judgement of our Adversaries, creat to the Hierarchicks a vexatious Scruple, and pungent Objection, is so far from glossing them, as thereby to leave any room for a Diocesan Bishop, that he plainly informs us, that these Scriptures only suffice to dissolve all our Scruples and period the Dispute. 'Tis evident then that *OEcumenius*, commenting on *Philip. 1. 1.* or wherever he seems to say nothing against a superiority of Diocesans, spoke only out of compliance with the Custom of his time, or some such weakness. Neither is the matter less clear of *Theodoret*, who, altho' he ascribes an Episcopal Dispensation over the *Philippians* to *Epaphroditus*, yet even then he looks on him as no ordinary or fixed Officer, which is really yeelded by *Petavius* (q) and is plain from *Theodoret* himself (r) *The Apostle* (saith he) calls a *Presbyter* a *Bishop*, as we shew'd when we expos'd the *Epistle* to the *Philippians*. Which may be also learn'd from this *Place*. For after the *Precepts* proper to *Bishops*, he describes the things that agree to *Deacons*, omitting the *Presbyters*. But, as I said, of old they call'd the same Men both *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, but these who are now call'd *Bishops* they then call'd *Apostles*: But afterward the name of *Apostle* was left to the real *Apostles*: And the name *Bishop* giv'n to these that were of old call'd *Apostles*. Thus *Epaphroditus* was the *Apostle* of the *Philippians* ----- Thus was *Titus* the *Apostle* of the *Cretians*, *Timothy* of the *Asians*, Thus the *Apostles* and *Presbyters* at *Jerusalem* wrote to the *Antiochians*. And on *1 Cor. 12. 28.* ----- first *Apostles* ----- The *Apostle* saith not God hath sent onlie Twelve *Apostles* but also the *Seventy*. And these who also received the like *Grace*. For *Paul* himself after his Calling was of the same Order, and *Barnabas* and many others. And again he calls *Epaphroditus* the *Apostle* of the *Philippians*. Where 'tis clear as the Sun, that *Theodoret*, by these his *Bishops* or *Apostles*, understands only the real *Apostles* themselves together with *Timothy* and *Titus* and other such *Evangelists* and extraordinary Officers, who never had any fixed Station. And this was well perceiv'd by the *Jesuite Medina*, who therefore really yeelds *Theodoret* with *Hierome*, *Aërius*, *An-*

(q) Apud Wal. Mefs. Pag. 80. (r) In priorem Ep. ad Tim. Cap. 3.  
gustine

Sect. 8. *examin'd and disprov'd.* 171  
*gustine &c.* to the Presbyterians, and warmly recented by *Petrus*,  
 who, besides many other places, spends at once near a (f) whole Chap-  
 ter to prove *Theodoret* a self repugnant blunderer. Hence it's clear that  
 they can't rent *Theodoret* from us, untill (*Tullus-like*) they first rent  
 him from himself. Wherever therefore these Ancients so spoke as that  
 they seem'd not to oppose the Divine Right of Episcopacy; 'tis clear  
 they did so out of carelessness, or unwarrantable Compliance, but most-  
 ly, as may be gather'd from the handling *Airius* mett with, out of fear  
 least they had deriv'd on their Heads the hate of much of the then dege-  
 neraling Church, and tederalizing Clergy.

(f) *De Hierarchiâ Ecclesiasticâ. Lib. 2. Cap. 1.*

## Section VIII.

*More clear Testimonies of the primitive Doctors against the  
 Divine Right of Diocesan Episcopacy, and for the Iden-  
 tity of Bishop and Presbyter produc'd and vindicated.*

THE Bishop (saith *Ambrose* (a) or rather *Hilary*, the ancient-  
 est Commentator save some Fragments of *Origen*, now extant)  
 because he opens the hidden sense of the Scriptures, is said to Prophecy,  
 chiefly because he dispenses the words of future hope. Behold the very Idea  
 the Ancients still retain'd of a Bishop, and yet it's nothing but the real  
 Notion of every true Pastor or Dispenser of the Word and Sacraments,  
 Which Order may now be that of the Presbyters. For in the Bishop are all Orders;  
 for he is the first Priest that is the Prince of Priests, and Prophet, and Evangelist.  
 And whatsoever else is for fulfilling the Office of the Church and Service of the  
 Faithfull. And, The Apostle calls Timothy a Presbyter whom he had insti-  
 tuted a Bishop, for the first Presbyters were called Bishops; so that one Dying the  
 next succeeded. And lastly, in Egypt the Presbyters ordain in the Bishop's  
 absence; where we see what he means by the Prince of Priests, and that  
 with him a Bishop was nothing but the first either in Age or in respect  
 of Ordination amongst the Colledge of Presbyters without any other

(a) In Epist. ad Ephes. Cap. 4.

Z 2

Prehemi.

Preheminence or Power over the rest but what these respects gave them. Which, I'm sure, exceeds not the Dignity of a Moderator of a Synod or Presbyter. "But because the following Presbyters were not found "worthy of the first place this way was changed by a Council that none "by his being first in order, but by his desert might be made a Bishop, "and that by the Votes of many Priests, least an unworthy Man should "rashly usurp the Office to the offence of many. There were born "Priests under the Law of the Race of *Aaron* the Levite, but now all "are Priests according to the Apostle *Peter*; and therefore Priests may "be chosen out of the People. And on 1 to *Timothy* 3. "But after the "Bishop he straight way subjoins the Ordination of a Deacon, and why? "But because of Bishop and Presbyter there's but one Ordination for "both of them are Priests, but the Bishop is first, so that every Bishop "is a Presbyter not every Presbyter a Bishop, for he's the Bishop who "is first among the Presbyters. Finally the Apostle shews that *Timothy* "was ordain'd a Presbyter, but because he had no other Presbyter before him he was a Bishop. And from thence he shews how *Timothy* "can Ordain a Bishop for 'twas not lawfull for the Inferiour to Ordain "a Superiour.

§. 2. Hence appears the perverseness of *Bellarmino* (b) affirming that *Hilary* says only there was no need of a new Election, but denies not (saith he) the necessity of a Consecration or Episcopal Ordination. A flat Contradiction of *Hilary's* express saying that there's but one Ordination of both Bishop and Presbyter, and that even *Timothy* was of no higher Order than that of a Presbyter, whose whole primacy consisted in his meer being the first Presbyter in respect of age or time of his Ordination as *Hilary* hath taught us: And so, as he doth also all-along thro' the fore-cited Passages, explains fully his calling the Bishop Prince of Priests, which the Cardinal also objects, and shews that thereby we're to understand only such a Dignity as either meer priority of Ordination or Seniority yeelds. Thus *Hierome* also understands this Title, who (c) calls *Peter* Prince of the Apostles, and yet asserts (d) that any Priority *Peter* had was given to his Age only, which in that very place he makes as good as nothing. Informing us that the Church was equally founded on all the Apostles, and that the rest no less than *Peter* received the Keys. Take but ano-

(b) De Clericis. Cap. 15. (c) Catal. Scriptor. (d) Tom. 2. Fol. 12.—*Et ait delatum est quia Petrus senior erat.*

ther place of *Hilary*, "By Angels (*sau'd he (e)*) the Apostle means the "Bishops as we learn in the *Revelation of John*, who being Men are chal- "leng'd for not reproving the people, or commended for their Vertues "----- And because Sin entred by the Woman she ought to have this "token that in the Church, for the reverence to the Bishop, her head "ought not to be free but cover'd with a vail; and she has not power to "speak because the Bishop represents Christ's person; she ought there- "fore because of the Original of Transgression appear subje& before the "Bishop as before the Judge because he is the Lord's Vice-gerent. Here we see that, according to *Hilary*, there was a Bishop over every Congregation, and in every place of publick Worship frequented by Men and Women, and that the Apocalyptick Angels were only such Congregational Pastors. From which we may well gather that when any in these early times had the name *Bishop* more peculiarly giv'n them, yet the Primacy could be but only of Order, and nominal which is fitly illustrated by the *Athenian Archons*.

*Petavius* therefore (*f*) to shield his Cause from so deadly blows, does his outmost to discredit these Commentaries, and make their Author some obscure fellow: and to prove they belong not to *Hilary* the *Luciferian*, he brings two passages thereof that shew their Author to have been of the Roman Communion which *Hilary* deserted. But might he not have been of that Communion when he wrote the commentaries, and yet deserted it afterward? This the Jesuit attempts not to disprove. But whosoever this Author was, or by whatsoever name known, neither are we hurt nor the Hierarchicks helped thereby; his Authority is unquestionably great, being cited by the Councils of *Paris* and *Aix* (*g*) no mean Conventicles under the name of *Ambrose*: afterward the learn'd, as *Bellarmino* (*h*) and the Divines of *Louvain* (*i*) gave these Commentaries to *Hilary* a Roman Deacon and stout Opposer of the *Arrians*; the Foundation of which Opinion is strong: For *Augustine* oftner than once attributes these Commentaries to *Hilary*.

And it's likely that *Petavius* knew that the Authority of this Writer was not to be shaken with all his Cavills, but only at that time he had

(*e*) In 1. ad *Cor.* 11. 10. (*f*) De Hierarchia Eccles. Lib. 1. Cap. 12.  
 (*g*) Apud *Blondellum*. (*h*) De scrip. Eccles. (*i*) In Scholis ad Cap. 4. Lib. 4. *Augustini* contra duas Epistolas *Pelagiani*.

found nothing else to say, wherefore he afterwards (k) excogitates more Quibbles to darken and deprave this Author; and chiefly strives to make Hilary speak nothing for the Right of Seniority, and against the Election of a Successor to any deceasing Bishop. He says therefore that when Hilary tells us, that one dying, the next or following succeeded, we must not understand it in respect of Years or Ordination, but any of 'em indefinitely taken, who was notwithstanding afterward to be elected by the Clergy, but all the Presbyters in time becoming unworthy of the Episcopal Honour the Method was altered, and another not out of the Colledge of Presbyters, but out of some other Order according to their desert was admitted unto that Office. To support which Gloss, he brings Hierome's saying that the Presbyters of Alexandria named one elected from among themselves, Bishop, as if Hierome were not speaking of Alexandria alone, and to instance therein, that Prelacy came not soon to any growth; or as if Hierome and Hilary could not agree in its being of humane Original, and yet differ in the circumstances of its rise. The rest of his prolix Discourse on this Theme is only a train of meer Cavills and Clouds too thin and airy to feed a very Chameleon, all which are quite dissolv'd and disappear if we but look into one small parcell of Hilary's words, where he tells us that after the Method was altered then the Bishop whose desert raised him was constitute by the Judgement or Votes of many Priests or Presbyters: For this Clause being of design inserted by Hilary to shew the Opposition between the latter and the former Method of coming to the Primacy, proclaims that as after the Change, Suffrages and Election were used, so before this Change, there had been no such Custome. With this the Jesuite darres not ingage nor with Hilary's making the Ordination of both Bishop and Presbyter, the same, his making Timothy only a Presbyter, his placing all the Essence or Constitutive of a Bishop in being the first Presbyter of the Colledge, his giving a Bishop to every Congregation, &c. These I say, he never adventures once in the least to handle; wherefore surely he was conscious to himself that he spent both Pains and Brains for the sole production of a bulkish nothing.

§ 3. To Hilary I add *Chrysostome* ( which *Theophylact* his real Epitomator transcribes ) After (saith he (l) ) the Apostle had discoursed

(k) In appendix ad Hierarchiam. Lib. 2. Cap. 1. (l) In prior. Epist. ad Tim. homilia 11<sup>ma</sup>. διαλεγόμενος πρὶ ἐπισκόπων — τί δὴ ποτε; ὅτι οὐ πολὺ τον μέτον δι' ἑσὶ καὶ ἐπισκόπων καὶ ὁ καὶ αὐτοὶ διδασκαλίαν εἶναι ἀνασχεγμένοι, καὶ προσαίτιν τῆς ἐκκλησίας καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐπισκόπων εἶναι, ταῦτα καὶ προσβυτέρους ἀρμόζει τῇ γὰρ χειροτονία μόνῃ υπερβεβήκασιν, καὶ τούτῳ μόνον δοκεῖ πλεονεκτεῖν τὰς πρεσβυτέρας ὅς.

CONCERN-

Sect. 8. *examin'd and disprov'd.* 175  
 concerning the Bishops, and described them, declaring what they ought to have,  
 and from what they ought to abstain; omitting the order of Presbyters he descends  
 to the Deacons; and why so? But because between Bishop and Presbyter in a  
 manner there is no difference, seeing that also to the Presbyters the Care or Govern-  
 ment the Church is committed, and whatsoever he said of Bishops agrees also to  
 the Presbyters, in Ordination alone they are Superiour, and they seem to have  
 this onlie more than the others. Where he clearly overthrows all their Dis-  
 tinction between Bishop and Presbyter; notwithstanding that to some he  
 may seem to give the Power of Ordination to Bishops above Presbyters.  
 For First, The words are most capable of another Translation. Thus  
 only in the Matter of Ordination they have got up or set themselves a-  
 bove them. Secondlie, Of the Power of Ordination, it's being proper  
 to Bishops, he speaks most doubtfully *δοκουν* they seem &c. (saith he).  
 Thirdly, Had he believ'd that the Power of Ordination by Divine Right  
 belong'd to Bishops above Presbyters, he had never said that there's not-  
 withstanding in a manner nothing between them: surely Epiphanius  
 thought the Power of Ordination made a most large and notable Differ-  
 ence. Once again I shall with our Adversaries suppose that Chrysostome  
 allows that Power of Ordination by Divine Appointment was appropri-  
 ated to Bishops they can't with reason deny, but that, in all other things  
 to a hair, he asserts the Equality, yea the Identity of Presbyters with Bi-  
 shops. Now will they stand to Chrysostome herein? Surely they will  
 not; for thus they should be oblig'd to let go all the Prerogatives and  
 Priviledges Bishops both claim and exerce over their Pastors, all their  
 Power Paramount of Governing the Church and her Pastors, all their  
 exorbitant Wealth, Grandeur, Pomp, and Splendor, and, in a word,  
 whatsoever renders to them the *Hierarchy* amiable or desireable, and so  
 should be really reduc'd to the condition of an ordinary Parish-pastor.  
 And were things so, little, I'm sure, would they care or stickel for up-  
 holding of any Distinction between these Officers: hence let them blush  
 any more to pretend to Chrysostome's Patrociny: seeing all they can,  
 with the least colour plead for, being giv'n, not granted, he really sub-  
 verts their Cause, and levells their Diocesan Prelat with a parochial Pa-  
 stor.

§. 4. Bellarmine (m) Answers that Chrysostome and others, while  
 they say that onlie in Ordination a Bishop is above a Presbyter, speak onlie of such

(m) De Clericis. Cap. 15. 10.

things



things which no way agree to Presbyters for Jurisdiction and Confirmation may be performed by Presbyters by virtue of Commission from the Bishop. But thus he really makes *Chrysostome* contradict himself: *Chrysostome* said they differ'd nothing save in Ordination; *Bellarmino* compells him to say that they have another Difference no less conspicuous than is between the King and his Commissioner, who can do many regal Acts, being warranted by him thereto. Does such a Power lodg'd in the Bishop, which agrees to none of the Presbyters, make no Distinction between him and them? Or rather, does it not make up the far greater and more conspicuous part of the prelatical Eminency above the rest of the Clergy? Add hereto *Chrysostome's* Books of the Priest-hood, wherein, altho' he expressly professes he was to treat of the Office of a Bishop, yet in these Books there's nothing but what concerns a congregational Pastor, nothing but what concerns publick prayer, dispensing of the Word and Sacraments, and such Duties that terminat on the People alone, but not a word of the Duties of the Bishop or Prelat over inferiour congregational Pastors as their Object which is a sure Demonstration that, with *Chrysostome*, Bishop, Priest, and Pastor were Synonymous Terms.

§. 5. To these add *Pelagius* a grand Heretick indeed, but never branded as such for ought he said of Church-Government, who (n) restricts all Church-Officers to Priest and Deacon. And (o) asserts that Priest without any Discrimination or Restriction are the Successors of the Apostles. And (p) Here (saith he) by Bishops we understand Presbyters for there could not have been more Bishops in one Citie: but we have this Matter also in the Acts of the Apostles. Where it's clear that *Pelagius*, altho', in conformity to the introduc'd Custome of distinguishing Bishops from preaching Presbyters, he endeavour'd accordingly to expone this place with as little damage thereto as is possible, deduceth notwithstanding the Ground of the Difference between Bishop and Presbyter from the Churches latter Custome of having but one Bishop in one City, and not from any Scripture-Warrant, and indeed when he brings to clear his Comment the 20. of the Acts 17. and 28. he plainly intimats that even when he and others of that Age seem most clearly to hold forth a Difference betwixt Bishop and preaching Presbyter, they then believ'd no such thing to flow from Divine Institution.

(n) In *Rom.* 12. (o) In *1 Cor.* 1. (p) In *Philip.* 1. 1.

And

And (q) *There is a Question* (saith he) *why the Apostle made no mention of Presbyters but comprehended them under the Name of Bishops, because,* (answers he) *this is the second, yea, in a manner, the very same Degree with that of Bishops, as the Apostle writes in the Epistle to the Philippians; To the Bishops and Deacons: when yet one City can't have more Bishops than one: and, in the Acts of the Apostles, Paul being to go to Hierusalem and having gathered the Elders of the Church, saith, among other things, take heed to the Flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you Bishops.* Hence it's most evident that he believed both Offices to be, by Scripture-Warrant, one and the same, and not a meer Communication of Names only. But the thing most observable here, is, that to prove the Identity of *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, he brings *Philip. 1.* and hereby shews us, that some of the Ancients, from whose accustom'd Phrases he departed not while he expounded it, when they seem to infer from that place, only a Community of Names, did really believe no such thing, but were perswaded that *Philip. 1. 1.* quite overthrows all Distinction betwixt Bishop and preaching Presbyter. And *Sedulius (r)* asserts and proves the Identity of *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, and concludes from the Example of the *Ephesian Elders* or *Bishops*, that *there were many Bishops in one City*, contrary to the Practice of his Age; and that, among the Ancients, *Bishop* and *Presbyter* was one and the same. And *Primasius (s)* proposeth the Question, why the Apostle comes to the Deacons without any mention of the Presbyters? And Answers in the very words of *Pelagius*. Thus it's clear, even these whom the Hierarchicks take for the prime Pillars of Prelacy being Judges, that there's no Divine Warrant for Diocesan Episcopacy, and that a Bishop and Presbyter in Scripture in Apostolick times are one and the same.

For (saith (t) *Augustine*, (with whom I begin, tho' Younger than *Hierome*, being longer to insist on the other) *tho' according to these Names of Honour which the Custome of the Church hath now brought in fashion the Office of a Bishop be greater than that of a Presbyter, yet in many things Augustine is below Hierome; where we see that the whole Difference was in Expression rather than reality, and that even that was only by Custome not by Divine Appointment. These words (hath now brought in fashion* (answers *Bellarmino (u)* *are not opposed to the ancient time of the*

(q) In 1 Tim. 3. (r) In Tit. 1. (s) In 1 Tim. 3. (t) Epist. 19. ad Hieronymum. (u) De Clericis. Cap. 15.

178      *The Fundamentals of the Hierarchy*      Part II.  
*Church, but to the time before the Christian Church, so that the sense is, before the times of the Christian Church these Names Bishop and Presbyter were not Titles of Honour but of Office and Age, but now they are Names of Honour and Dignity.* D. *M.* follows his Master Bellarmine in this wretch'd Detortion, (x) and adds that this was but a mannerly Complement to *Augustine*. A piece of immodesty proper to D. *M.* not arriv'd at by the Jesuite; *Augustine* then was only some frenchify'd Spark that intended not to speak as he thought: but I reply with *Junius* (y) that this their Answer is clean contrary to *Augustine's* mind and intention; for he was not so mad as to compare things so heterogeneous as were the Rites and Customs of the Gentiles, and these of the Church: if it be said that he spoke of the Church of the Jews, where, pray, is there any mention of Bishops in all the Old Testament, and History of the Jewish Church. I add that if this had been *Augustine's* meaning, he had too much drepress'd, and in too unworthy Terms express'd Christ's Institution to busk a Complement for *Hierome*. But *Augustine*, saith D. *M.* reasons from the Succession of Bishops. This Romish Cavill is a 1000 times baffl'd, and by none more sufficiently than by Dr. *Stillingfleet* (z) who shews "that from such Reasonings of the Fathers, and their mentioning of Successions of Bishops, it can never be  
 "proved that Bishops were of a higher Order, or had any other Power  
 "over Presbyters, nor that in all places there was so much as any Difference at all between them, nor that they mean'd ought save a Succession of Doctrine, and that no less is said of Presbyters.

Lastly, *Bishop Jewel* (a) advanceth this very passage of *Augustine*, and thereby proves the Identity of Bishop and Priest or Presbyter. And he thus Englishes *Augustine's* words, *The Office of a Bishop is above the Office of a Priest, not by Authority of the Scriptures, but after the Names of Honour, which the Custome of the Church hath now obtain'd.*

§. 7. "Let us (saith *Hierome* (f)) attend diligently to the words  
 "of the Apostle saying that thou should'st Ordain Elders in every City  
 "as I appointed thee, and what kind of Presbyter ought to be ordain'd,  
 "he declares in the following Discourse; If any (saith he) be blameless, the Husband of one Wife &c. and after, he Inferrs, For a Bishop must  
 "be blameless as the Steward of God; Therefore both Bishop and

(x) Page 81. & seq. (y) Tom. 2. Col. 1214. (z) *Irenicum*. Pag. 300. & seq. (a) *Defens. apolog.* Pages 122, 123. (b) In *Epist. ad Titum*.

"Presbyter

"Presbyter is one and the same. And before that by Sathan's instigation there were Divisions about Religion, and it was said in the Churches, I am of *Paul*, I of *Apollo*, and I of *Cephas*, the Church was govern'd by a common Council of Presbyters: But after that whomsoever any had baptized were by them counted their own, not Christs, it was Decreed thro' the whole World that one, Chosen out of the Presbyters, should be set over the rest to whom all care of the Church should belong, and the Seeds of Division be removed. But you may think that this is our Mind and not the Mind of the Scriptures that a Bishop and a Presbyter is one and the same thing, and that the one is a Name of *Age*, and the other of *Office*. Let them read over the words of the Apostle to the *Philippians*, where, as *Hierome* professedly asserts the Presbyterian *Thesis*, so he clearly proves it by the Presbyterian Arguments. And I would fain learn wherein, as touching the Scriptural Identity of *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, he differ'd from *Aërius*. They differ'd as much (answers *Bellarmino* (c) as Heaven and Hell. For *Hierome* still held that a *Bishop* was greater than a *Presbyter* as to the point of Ordination, and that doubtless by *Divine Right*. *Bellarmino* is herein follow'd only by some of the more impudent of his Brethren as *Bayly* the Jesuite and *Petavius*; and last of all appears their perpetual shadow D. *M.* (d) with whom *Hierome* is a grand Asserter of the Episcopal Hierarchy, and *Aërius* a grand Heretick. But *Junius* (e) answers to both the Jesuites and their Genuine Issue, that *Hierome*, when he said, what doth the *Bishop* except Ordination which a *Presbyter* does not? understood it only of his own time. But *Bellarmino* (saith *Junius*) confounds the time (as doth D. *M.*) that he more easily may deceive the Simple. We have heard already that many of the greatest Lights of the Church of England, yea, and of the Romanists, have exploded this shamefull and Jesuitical Attempt of making *Hierome* for the Divine Right of Prelacy, or for any Difference between *Bishop* and *Presbyter*. To which add Dr. *Stillingfleet*. For (saith he (f)) as to the Matter it self, I believe upon the strictest Enquiry, *Medina's* Judgement will prove true that *Hierome*, *Austine*, *Ambrorse*, *Sedulius*, *Primasius*, *Chrysostome*, *Theodoret*, *Theophylact*, were all of *Aërius's* Judgement as to the Identity of both Name and Order of Bishops and Presbyters in the primitive Church &c. Of what Church then

(c) *De Clericis*. Lib. 1. Cap. 15. (d) Page 65. & seq. (e) Col. 1212.

(f) *Irenicum*, Page 275.

shall we count D. *M.* and his Brethren who only scrape together these most dishonest and a thousand times baw'd depravations and perversions of the Jesuites, and being plum'd with the feathers of so unlucky Birds, can appear without any more shame and blushing than as if they were the innocent pens of a Dove? But Hierome (subjoins Bellarmine, who is transcrib'd by D. *M.*) acknowledges that the Difference between Bishop and Presbyter, as also the Princely Prerogatives of Bishops, was introduc'd by the very Apostles, when 'twas said, I am of Paul &c. But it's answer'd by Junius [g] that "the former of these can never be prov'd from Hierome, and the latter Hierome denies, while he saith, when these whom any baptiz'd were counted their own &c. Where [saith Junius] Hierome shews that 'twas not when this Evil was at Corinth only, but when 'twas spread thro' the whole Churches: And the latter of these [continues Junius] Paul denies while he reproves this Evil in the Corinthians, and yet neither in the first nor in the second Epistle makes ever the least mention of setting up a Bishop over them. They who use this Argument (saith Dr. Stillingfleet (h) among many other Answers far better than ever such a Cavill deserv'd) are greater Strangers to St. Hierome's Language than they would seem to be, whose Custome it is, upon incidental Occasions to accommodat the Phrase and Language of Scripture to them as when he speaks of Chrysostome's Fall, cecidit Babylon, cecidit, of the Bishops of Palestine, multi utroque claudicant pede----- All which Instances (saith the Doctor) are produc'd by Blondel, but have the good fortune to be pass'd over without being taken notice of. And now judge whether there was more Ignorance or Impudence in D. *M.*'s following Query (i) Whether the Opinion of St. Hierome be not disingenuously represented by the Presbyterians, since he never acknowledg'd nor affirm'd any intervall after the Death of the Apostles, in which Ecclesiastical Affairs were govern'd communi Presbyterorum consilio? Bellarmine objects also (as doth his Epe D. *M.*) that Hierome says James was made Bishop of Jerusalem, presently after the Death of our Saviour. But both are repell'd by Junius (k) who shews that the common reading of that place of Hierome's Catalogue is corrupted. And Answers that James was only left while the Apostles went thro' the World for the Commodity of that Church, and was never absolutely ordain'd a Bishop by the Apostles, for James himself was an Apostle. Of the

(g) Tom. 2. Col. 1213. (h) Iren. Page 280. (i) Page 159.  
[k] Col. 1213.

same Mind is *Salmasius*, that *James* resided not at Jerusalem as one of their *Hierarchick Bishops*, but as an *Apostle* (1) And yet *D. M.* (m) is not asham'd to tell his Reader, as the *Concession* of *Salmasius*, that we have a *Diocesan Bishop* establish'd in the person of *St. James* the Just, in the City of Jerusalem. Now that *Hierome* understood *James's* Episcopacy in the sense giv'n by *Junius* and *Salmasius* against the Jesuites, is most apparent especially if we consider how the Ancients us'd to speak of the Apostles and Apostolick extraordinary Church-Officers in the Stile of their own times, and how positive *Hierome* was for the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter during the Apostolick age and first primitive Church.

Add hereto that *Hierome* (as he shews in his Preamble to *Dexter*) was altogether uncertain of much of what he wrote in his *Catalogue of Writers*, which is yet more clear from his account of *Paul*, for the writes that he was a Native of *Gischalis*, and during the Wars between the Jews and Romans fled with his Parents to *Tarsus* when *Gischalis* was taken. Which, I'm sure, *Hierome*, a Man so well acquaint with the Affairs of the Jews, who had no Wars with the Romans for many years after the time wherein the Fabler, whom *Hierome* transcribes, suppos'd these Wars to have been commens'd, and *Gischalis* taken, could never believe; but only, because he could light on no better, transcrib'd things as he found 'em. Which removes, tho' no more could be said, *D. M's* Objection from *Hierome's* mentioning of *Ignatius* his Epistles, whereon *D. M.* with no small Ostentation insists. He follows also *Bellarmino* objecting that *Hierome* makes Bishops the Apostles Successors. But *Junius* Replies that *Hierome* denies not this to be also the privilege of Presbyters. It's also objected by *Dr. Pearson* (n) that *Hierome*, in his Epistle to *Heliodorus*, speaks of the Deacons as the third Order. And seeing this, of all the passages of *Hierome* produc'd by the Papiists to involve him in self-repugnancy, is most plausible, take it at full length. If a Man (saith *Hierome* (o)) desires the Office of a Bishop, he desires a good Work: These things we know; but add what follows, A Bishop then must be blameless &c. and having express'd the rest of the things which there follow concerning a Bishop, the Apostle uses no less diligence, in setting forth the Duties of the third Degree, saying, Likewise let the Deacons be grave &c. But passing that he was scarce

(1) Vide inter alia *Wal. Meff.* Page 45. Et seq. & Page 192. Et seq.  
(m) Page 138. (n) *Vind. St. Ignat.* Part 1. Pages 191, 192. (o) Epist. ad *Heliodorum*.



more than a Child when he wrote that Epistle, and wrote clearly for the Identity of *Bishop* and *Presbyter* in his riper years, it's certain he pretends no Divine Warrant for this Tripartition. Yea from the very words they would now detort, it's most evident that tho' *Hierome*, following the Custom of his Age, mentions a third Degree, he notwithstanding takes both *Paul's Bishop* and *Presbyter* for one and the same thing. Moreover in this same Epistle *Hierome* makes all who had the Power of Dispensing the Sacraments, Successors to the Apostles (p). which the Jesuites and their Supporters appropriat to Bishops: hence they are baffl'd with the very places of *Hierome* they endeavour to abuse.

§. 7. But I return to *Hierome*, *Philippi*, continues he, is a single Town of Macedonia, and truly in one City there could not be (called are they as) "moe Bishops. But because at that time they called the same Men "both Bishops and Presbyters, therefore he spoke indifferently concerning both Bishops and Presbyters. From these words (saith *Petavins* (q) It can be evidently demonstrated that *Hierome* believed that "Bishops and Presbyters were not one and the same Order, yea even "in the Age of the Apostles: For had he so believ'd he had never said "that there could not be a plurality of Bishops in one City, when surely "there was a plurality of Presbyters. As if *Jerome's* whole discourse, scope, and conclusion, were not directly opposite to what the Jesuite impudently fathers on him, who in the words *Petavius* abuses, only meets with some *Wranglers* as he elsewhere terms them, who, to elude the proof *Jerome* brought for the Identity of *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, from *Philippians* 1. & 1. absurdly contended that in the City of *Philippi* alone there were a multitude of Bishops distinguish'd from, and superior to other Pastors. "But yet this may seem doubtfull (continous *Jerome*) to some except it be confirmed by another Testimony. It is written in the Acts of the Apostles that when the Apostle "was come to *Miletum* he sent to *Ephesus* and called for the Elders of "that Church, to whom, amongst other things, he said, take heed to "your selves and to the Flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made "you Bishops to feed the Church of Christ.----- And observe this "diligently how the Apostle calling the Elders of *Ephesus*, which was "but one City afterwards names them Bishops, if any receive the Epistle

(p) Absit ut de his quicquam sinistrum loquar: qui Apostolico gradui succedentes, Christi corpus sacro ore conficiunt: per quos & nos Christiani sumus &c. (q) *Appendice ad Hierarchiam* Lib. 2. Cap. 5.

"which

“which under *Paul's* Name is written to the Hebrews, there also the  
 “care of the Church is equally divided amongst a plurality. For he  
 “writes to the People, *Obey your Governours and be subject to them,*  
 “*for the Lords watch* ----- And *Peter*, who received his Name from the  
 “strength of his Faith, saith in his Epistle, *The Elders which are among*  
 “*you I exhort who am also an Elder* ----- We have enlarged on  
 “these things that we might shew that among the Ancients Bishops were  
 “all one with Presbyters. *Hierome* then never, as *Petavius* and his Fol-  
 lowers impudently pretend, thought that there had hapned no alterati-  
 on, or that Bishops bore greater bulk in his time than they had done  
 in the Age of the Apostles ) “but by little and little to the end the seeds  
 “of Schism might be remov'd, the whole care was devolv'd upon one;  
 “wherefore as the Presbyters know that by the Custome of the Church  
 “they are subject to their prefect, so let Bishops know that rather by  
 “Custome than by the Truth of Christ's Institution they are greater than  
 “Presbyters, and ought to Rule the Church in common with them, i-  
 mitating *Moses* who, when he alone had Power to Rule the *Israelites*,  
 “chused other Seventy with whom he might judge the People. Here  
 (say they) is a proof of Superiority of Bishops by Divine Right, but  
 they should remember that *Hierome* here undertook to prove the quite  
 contrary. And it's most unjust to fish and search for self-contradictions  
 in any Author when with ease he may be understood otherways as the  
 Matter is here. *Hierome* is arguing *a majori ad minus*, from *Moses* his  
 Practice who, tho' he had sole Authority by Divine Right, yet shar'd it  
 with others, to that which ought to have been done by the Bishops of  
 his time whom only Church Custome not Christ's Appointment had  
 raised over other Pastors. And indeed they might on equal grounds  
 infer from *John* 13. 14. *If I then your Lord and Master have washed*  
*your Feet, ye ought also to wash one anothers Feet*, that every Apostle  
 yea and every Believer is Lord and Master of the rest.

§. 8. And writing to *Euagrius* I hear (saith *Hierome*) “there is one  
 “so mad as to prefer the Deacons to the Presbyters that is to the Bi-  
 “shops. For seeing the Apostle clearly teaches that Bishops and Pres-  
 “byters are one and the same; how can a Server of Tables and Widows,  
 “proudly prefer himself to these at whose Prayers the Sacrament of  
 “Christ's Body and Blood is consecrated: you will require a Proof, hear  
 “a Testimony, *Paul* and *Timothy* to all the Saints in *Philippi* with the Bi-  
 shops

*“Sops and Deacons; would you have another Example in the Acts of  
 “of the Apostles, Paul thus speaks to the Presbyters of one Church,  
 “Take heed to your Selves and the whole Flock over which the Holy Ghost hath  
 “made you Bishops to Rule the Church, &c. And that none may conten-  
 “tiously plead that in one City there were many Bishops, here also a-  
 “nother Testimony wherein it’s most evidently proved that both Pres-  
 “byter and Bishop were one and the same, and then produces “the 1 to  
 “Titus, and 1 to Timothy 4. 8. 14. neglect not ----- with the laying  
 “on of the Hands of the Presbytry. And 1 Peter 4 and 1. 2 John 1.  
 3 John 1. And all these to prove that he had undertaken viz. that both  
 Bishop and Presbyter were one and the same. Now it’s most observable that  
 that he infers this Conclusion not only from Scriptures written long  
 after the first Epistle to the Corinthians, where it’s said, *I am of Paul &c.*  
 but even from the last Epistle of John the longest Liver of all the Apo-  
 stles. And therefore no less noticeable is D. M’s extream stubbor-  
 neness and aversion from Truth, who would force Hierome to introduce Bi-  
 shops presently after that Schism mention’d 1 Cor. 1. And accordingly,  
 as his bad Cause oblig’d him to do with this and the rest of Hierome’s  
 Testimonies, wholly smother’d it. And indeed all hitherto who have  
 adventur’d to grapple therewith have been conquer’d thereby, yea even  
 Bellarmine himself is compell’d to give up the Cause. Hierome indea-  
 vours, (saith the Jesuite (r)) to conclude the equality of Bishops and Pres-  
 byters from the Epistle to Titus, to the Philippians, and from the Epistles of  
 Peter and John which were written after the first Epistle to the Corinthians.  
 Neither can the Jesuite find another way to be even with Hierome, but  
 by arraigning him as fraughted with self-repugnancy, levity, and in-  
 stability in this Matter; and all the Arguments he brings to prove Hie-  
 rome a Favourer of Episcopacy are only so many fruitless Attempts to  
 make that appear.*

But let us go on with Hierome. But (saith he) the reason why after  
 this (viz. the writing of both the Epistles of John) one was chosen and set  
 over the rest, was that there might be a remedy of Schism, least every one, draw-  
 ing the Church of Christ to himself, should divide it. For in Alexandria from  
 Mark the Evangelist even to Heraclas and Dionysius the Presbyters still gave  
 to one elected from amongst themselves, and placed in a higher seat, the Name of  
 Bishop, as if an Army should creat a General, or the Deacons should chuse one

of themselves whom they know to be industrious and name him Arch-Deacon. On these words D. *M.* triumphs, *The Custome was* (saith he) *even from the days of St. Mark the Evangelist that a Presbyter was chosen who Governed the whole Society: this in the Opinion of St. Hierome cuts off that imaginary Interval, wherein the Church is said to have been Governed by a Parity of Presbyters.* Where he forgeth a Gloss no way contain'd in the words of Hierome, whose Example of an Army and Deacons are only adduc'd to shew the manner of that Presbyter or nominat'd Bishop's entrance, and not at all the measure of his Power over his Collegues. And that no Power over the rest can be collected from this place is beyond Scruple clear from Hierome's present Scope, who introduces this Ancient *Alexandrian* Practice to clear and prove the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter, which, according to him, remain'd in the Church for a while after the Writings of *John*, the longest Liver of all the Apostles. Had D. *M.* perused Dr. *Stillingfleet* (f) he had taught him that both Election and Ordination of this *Alexandrian Bishop* was only performed by his Fellow Presbyters, & that the Original of Hierome's exlors potestas, any Power he mentions in Bishops over Presbyters, is by Hierome attributed not to any Episcopal Institution but to the free choice of the Presbyters themselves: for what doth a Bishop (continues Hierome) except Ordination, which a Presbyter may not do. Here the Jesuites and their Follower D. *M.* dream they find a fine Distinction made by Hierome between Bishop and Presbyter: but first they must make an unseasonable *Antiptosis*, and compell Hierome to speak contrary to the exprefs words of this place which are in the present Tense, contrary to the scope and design of this Epistle, which is professedly to shew the great Dignity of Presbyters, yea even their Identity with Bishops, and thereby to reach a sharper reproof to the petulant Deacon. And contrary, finally, to Hierome's most clear and most frequently repeated Doctrine of the Scriptural Identity of both Offices. Were it not madness then to dream, with the Jesuits, that, in these words, Hierome makes any Distinction between the Scripture-Bishop and Presbyter, who is here only asserting that in all places (*Rome* excepted, where the Presbyters were more depressed and the Deacons more raised than in other Churches) even then in his time, a Presbyter was allow'd by the Canons and Constitutions of the Churches to do ought that a Bishop might do, save Ordination alone. This his Design of holding forth the most

(f) Irenicum. Pages 273, and 274.

great dignity of Presbyters, yea even their equality with Bishops, which *Bellarmino* acknowledges that he may the better compesce the Insolency of the Deacons, *Hierome* all along this Epistle prosecutes: and having again cited the Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus* to prove that a Presbyter is contain'd in, i. e. is one and the same with a Bishop, otherwayes a Deacon is also in a Bishop; and so *Hierome* had crossed his own Design by the very Argument wherewith he minded to compals it, and, having added some other Topicks to the same purpose, thus concludes his Epistle. And that we may know that the Apostolick Traditions are brought from the Old Testament, that which *Aaron* and his Sons, and the Levites were in the Temple, the Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons claim in the Church,

*Nunc animis opus Eneae, nunc pectore firmo.*

All the Jesuites and their Complices will presently be about our Ears, But

*Solamen nobis Socios habuisse malorum.*

Their Attaques are no less on *Hierome* than us, wherefore this is one of the chief places brought by *Bellarmino* (t) to involve *Hierome* in a maze of self-contradiction, and make him propugn Prelacy, who is followed by others of the Hierarchicks but chiefly the Jesuites: And lastly in the rear comes D. M. concluding "that the Hierarchy of the Christian Church is founded upon Apostolick Tradition, and that the Apostles had the Modell of the Temple in their view when they erected this Plat-form. But *Junius* (u) Answers "that their Conclusion is a non sequitur. For (saith he) "this comparison is not particular between each of these particular Officers under the Old Testament, and these under the New, but in common shewing, that as they are all obliged to serve the Church of the Jews, so all the Church-Officers under the New Testament ought to serve the Christian Church. Moreover, (continues *Junius*) "tho' we should give that the Comparison were particular, yet their Conclusion would not follow, seeing *Hierome* speaks only of the Church Polity of his own time, and the Question now is about *Hierome's* Sentiments of the Church Government and Polity in the Apostolick Age and first primitive Church. And that this in *Hierome's* Mind was not Hierarchick but a meer Parity of Pastors, *Junius* already evinced: and Dr. *Stillingsfleet* (x) at more length

(t) De Clericis. Cap. 15. (u) Col. 1213. (x) Irenicum. Pag. 265. &c seq. over-

overthrows this their Jesuitical Do&trine, and Demonstrats that by *Apos-  
tolicall Tradition* in Hierome only *Ecclesiastick Customs of some Antiquity* is  
mean'd, & asserts that "it's not imaginable that *Jerome* who had been pro-  
"ving all along the Superiority of a Presbyter above a Deacon, because  
"of his Identity with a Bishop in the Apostles times should at the same  
"time say that a Bishop was above a Presbyter by the Apostles Instituti-  
"on, and so directly overthrow all he had been saying before. The  
plain meaning (continues Dr. Stillingfleet) then of *Jerome* is no more but  
this, that as Aaron and his Sons in the Order of Priesthood were above the Le-  
vites under the Law: So the Bishops and Presbyters in the Order of the Evan-  
gelical Priesthood are above the Deacons under the Gospel. "For the Com-  
parison runs not between Aaron and his Sons under the Law, and Bi-  
shops and Presbyters under the Gospel; but between Aaron and his  
Sons, as one part of the Comparison under the Law, and the Levites  
under them as the other; so under the Gospel, Bishops and Presby-  
ters make one part of the Comparison, answering to Aaron and his  
Sons in that wherein they all agree; viz. the Order of Priesthood; and  
"the other part under the Gospel is that of Deacons, answering to the  
"Levites under the Law. The Opposition is not then in the Power  
"of Jurisdiction between Bishops and Priests, but between the same  
"Power of Order, which is alike both in Bishops and Presbyters (ac-  
"cording to the acknowledgement of all) to the Office of Deacons  
"which stood in Competition with them-----Hereby we see how un-  
"happily those Arguments succeed, which are brought from the Ana-  
"logy between the *Aaronical* Priesthood, to endeavour the setting up  
"of a *Jus Divinum* of a paralell Superiority under the Gospel. All  
"which Arguments are taken off by this one thing we're now upon, viz,  
"that the Orders and Degrees under the Gospel, were not taken up  
"from Analogy to the Temple,----- Other passages of *Jerome* they  
also study to abuse, but these now handl'd are the most specious. But  
of such Allegations out of *Jerome*, hear the same Dr. (y) "And among  
"all these fifteen Testimonies produced by a learned Writer out of *Je-  
rome* for the Superiority of Bishops above Presbyters, I cannot find  
"one that doth found it upon any *Divine Right*, but only upon the con-  
"venience of such an Order for the Peace and Unity of the Church of  
"God: But granting some passages may have a more favourable aspect



"towards the Superiority of Bishops over Presbyters in his other Writings, I would fain know whether a Man's Judgement must be taken from occasional and accidental Passages, or from designed and set Discourses; which is as much as to ask, whether the lively Representation of a man by picture, may be best taken, when in hast of other business he passeth by us, giving only a glance of his countenance, or when he purposely and designedly sits in order to that end that his countenance may be truly represented? He adds that *Jerome*, in his Commentaries, where he expressly declares not his own mind, transcribes often out of others without setting down their names &c.

§. 9. Most dishonest therefore is the conduct of the Loyolites, and of others of the Prelatists their Associates in this Matter, but above all men that of D. M. who, beside all this his foul dealing, following Bayly the Jesuite, has scarce adventur'd to lay before his Reader in English so much as one scrape or particle of what the Reform'd bring from *Jerome* against the Romanists and such Hierarchick Advocats; which in D. M. is the most certain product of both extream Disingenuity & Diffidence. But so great is the power of prejudice that they stick not to sacrifice both their Credit, and whatsoever else they should reckon most estimable, to such Dreams, as even most of the Church of England, yea and of the Romanists either acted by the love of the Truth or compell'd by its Power, had condemn'd. We have heard how Bishop *Jewel*, Dr. *Morton*, the Bishop of *Spalato*, and Dr. *Stillingfleet*, renounce and explode so palpable an untruth. And Dr. *Forbes* (2) is of the same Mind, yielding that *Hierome* is all one with *Aërius* in this, that Bishops by Divine Right are not at all Superior to Presbyters. And that these two are intirely of one and the same Mind, we have heard also granted by the most learn'd of the Romanists as *Alphonsus de Castro*, and *Meduna*, some whereof acknowledge, that none could be of another Opinion concerning them. And *Benedictus Justinianus* and other Romanists are of the same Mind. — How then, were all these Doctors sitting in Council to determine of this very Matter, should they chastise and brand these most partial and disingenuous Dealers, we have now to do with? Other Hierarchicks who would not confess so much in plain Terms, yet sometimes discover both their disingenuity and true Sentiments so palpably as if they had expressly made the same Confession. Dr. *Pearson*,

tho' he says nothing in his own Name, yet (a) acknowledges that Hierome *hath said so much for the Authority of Presbytry*, and endeavoured so much to establish it, that he is judged to make it well nigh equal to the Episcopal Order. And Bellarmine tells us that Hierome was selfrepugnant, and knew not what he said. And Petavins, tho' the most pertinacious wrangler of all the Society, grants (b) that Hierome makes Presbyters well nigh all one with Bishops but not the very same (saith the Jesuite) or intirely their Equals being Inferior in so much as they want the Power of Ordination. And (c) that according to Hierome's Mind meer Custome and not the Lord's Appointment gave to the Bishops above Presbyters any Power they have either in Ruling the Church, or external Government. And were things brought to this pass, I'm sure they should make but small account of the sory remainder Petavins makes Hierome leave them, as being altogether useless for support of the Pomp and Splendor of their Hierarchy. To these add the Jesuite Cellotius who after a thousand Meanders and serpentine windings to elude and deprave these clear Testimonies of Hierome, at length, seeing all would not do, rejects them all as the Forgeries of unlucky Aërian hands never written by Hierome. For which Cellotius is chastised even by Petavins and others of the Loyolites themselves. Into such Discord, Confusion and Torment do Men usually throw themselves, so soon as they obstinately resolve to wage War with so clear and irradiant Verities. And here it's observable that in all times, and in all Churches, the Authority of Hierome has been exceeding great, and above most of the primitive Writers which came not to pass without a special Divine Providence that he, and in him the whole primitive Church whose Judgement in these Matters he most clearly delivers, might remain as an unsuspected and an uncontroverted witness against some of latter Ages pretendedly Catholick but really Sectarian Novelists. Among the great Services he did to the Church, two Pieces are more especially noticeable viz. his most clear asserting and acurat distinguishing the Canonical Books from the Apocryphal above all who handled or wrote of that great and most necessary Article: and, which

(a) Vind. Ignat. Part. 2. Pag. 22. — *tam multa de Presbyteratus Autoritate congerit, ut cum eam stabiliat, a malem penè ipsi Episcopali potestati statuere censetur.* (b) Dog. Theol. Tom. 3. Pag. (mibi) 747. Hieronymus — *Presbyteros supares Episcopis facit &c.* (c) Pag. 756. — *revera Ecclesia potest item externamque Gubernationem sola consuetudine, non dispositionis Dominica Veritate Episcopis tribuit.*

is the Matter in hand, his Antiprelatick Doctrine of the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter: these not only *Hieronymian*, but also truly Catholick Doctrines are with equall fierceness impugn'd by the Romanists: and I appeal to the impartial Reader if their Exceptions against this latter be a whit more solide than these which are advanced against the former, viz. *Hierome's* Judgement of the Canonical Scriptures which are to be found collected and learn'dly refuted by Dr. *Cosin* (e). And indeed these Sophisters, endeavouring to subvert these Catholick Doctrines of *Hierome*, dash only on an Adamantine Rock: for as never any Articles were better founded, so, notwithstanding of whatsoever practical Aberrations therefrom were fall'n into, none were more universally imbrac'd, receiv'd and handed down: for to speak of the Matter of our present concern, this *Hieronymian* Doctrine all following Church Writers ratifie and approve; the bulk of subsequent Commentators, Writers of Offices and of other Treatises, as (f) *Salvianus*, *Isidorus Hispalensis* (g) *Amalaricus* (h), *Rabanus Maurus* (i), yea, and intire Councils as that 2 of *Sevil* (k) which ascribes the whole Difference and Superiority only to Church-Canons and late Constitutions: and after them *Gratian* (l) and *Lombard* (m), who affirm that in the primitive Church there was only Presbyters and Deacons and his Expositors, among whom is *Æstius* (n) who very fairly quites the Scriptures, and tells us that this Superiority is not very clear from Scripture, which is nothing but a Confession of the Truth of *Hierome's* Doctrine forced from this great Prelatist and School-man. Yet adds *Æstius*, this may be sufficiently proved another way. To which words Dr. *Stillingfleet* occurs. Ingeniously said (saith he (o)) however; but all the difficulty is, how a Jus Divinum should be prov'd, when Men leave the Scriptures. But in the recounting and transcribing of such Confessions or Testimonies, I will not enlarge. And now having rescued the principal Scriptures, our Antagonists detort in favours of their Distinction between Bishop and Presbyters, and vindicated some places commonly adduc'd for the Identity thereof, as also evinced that the most celebrated of the Ancients did no otherways understand these Scriptures, nor derive the Original of Prelacy from Divine Institution, I

(e) Scholast. Hist. Of the Canon of Scripture. Page 74. Et seq. (f) *Timotheus* Lib. 2. (g) *De Officiis*. Lib. 2. Cap. 8. Et de *Originibus*. Lib. 7. Cap. 12. (h) *Apud Blandellum*. Page 80. (i) *De constit. cler.* Lib. 2. Cap. 6. (k) *Can. 7.* (l) *Distinct. 60.* (m) *Sentent. Lib. 4. Distinct. 24.* (n) *Comment. In locum*, (o) *Iren.* pag. 294.

Sect. 9. *examin'd and disprov'd.* 191  
may with confidence conclude that *Ignatius* had none before him of the  
Judgement that he (if we believe the Hierarchicks) so passionately fa-  
vour'd.

---

## Section IX.

*The Testimonies of Ignatius's contemporaries disproving what  
our Adversaries would force him to speak, and confirm-  
ing what we have prov'd to be his mind, viz. that he  
cashiers a Diocesan Prelacy.*

**H**AVING viewed the Apostolick Writings and dived into their most  
ancient Commentators and primitive Doctors, and having found  
that in the time of the Apostles the immediat Ancestors of *Ignatius*  
there was in the Church no such thing as a Diocesan Prelate. Let us  
next look unto what remains of his Contemporaries or these who lived  
near *Ignatius's* time, and we shall have ground to deduce the same Infe-  
rence. And first it's observable that these Writers, such as *Clemens*  
*Romanus* in his Epistle to the *Corinthians* (for the rest that bear his Name  
are undoubtedly spurious) *Polycarp* to the *Philippians*, *Hermas* or *Pa-*  
*stor*, *Iustine Martyr*, tho' they, as occasion offers, frequently menti-  
on Pastors, Doctors, Bishops, Presbyters, indifferently taking all  
of 'em for on and the same Office, yet of a Diocesan Prelat, or one set  
over other Pastors, or over these that had Power of Dispensing the  
Word and Sacraments, in all their Writings have not a syllable. Which  
Argument against a Diocesan Prelat, tho' negative, is not to be slighted  
if we consider these Authors their clost Vicinity to the Apostles the oc-  
casion they had to have mention'd him had he been then existent, their  
more than a Pythagorick silence concerning him. Yea the same kind  
of negative Argumentation *Eusebius* uses, while he disproves and ex-  
plodes some Writings forg'd in the Name of *John*, *Andrew*, and other  
*Apostles* (a) because (saith he) no ancient Ecclesiastick Writers mention

(a) Hist. Eccles. Lib. 3. Cap. 25.

these

*these Books.* We shall find moreover that they positively disclaim Diocesan Prelacy. I begin with *Clemens Romanus*, who, writing to the *Corinthians*, commends their former carriage in these words, "Ye walked in the commands of God, and being obedient to these that had the rule over you, and giving your Elders due honour, ye were wont to admonish the younger with Moderation, to seek after things that are honest (b). And again (c) "Wherefore the Apostles, preaching the Word thro' the severall regions, and proving by the Spirit the first fruits thereof, ordain'd Bishops and Deacons for these who should believe: neither was this a new Ordinance, for many ages before, it was written concerning Bishops; for so in a certain place saith the Scripture, *I will appoint their Bishops in Righteousness and their Deacons in Faith.* And (d) "Our Apostles by Jesus Christ our Lord knew that there would arise Contention concerning the Name of a Bishop, and therefore, being endew'd with a perfect Fore-knowledge, they ordain'd the fore-said Officers, and left unto us describ'd the particular services of both Ministers and Offices, to the end that approv'd Men might succeed in the place of the defunct, and execute their Office. These therefore who are ordain'd by them or by other famous Men with the Consent of the whole Church, who blamelessly serv'd the Sheepfold of Christ with humility and quietness, & without baseness, and who for a long time had a good Testimony from all: These, I say, can't be justly thrust out of their Office: for we commit no light sin if we cast out these from the Bishops Office who holyly and blamelessly perform'd it. Blessed are these Presbyters or Pastors who have perfited their journey and are dead, and who have obtain'd a profitable departure: for they are not afraid least any thrust them out of their places into others: For we see that you have cast some from their Charge which they perform'd with honour. (e) It's base Beloved, yea very base and unworthy of a Conversation that is in Christ Jesus, to hear that the most stable and ancient Church of *Corinth*, for the sake of one or two should raise sedition against the Presbyters. And (f) "If I be the Cause of Contention, schism and sedition, I'll depart and be gone whithersoever ye will, and do what the People shall command, providing only that the sheepfold of Christ, with the Presbyters appointed over it, may have peace. And (g) "And you therefore,

(b) pag. 4. (c) pag. 58. (d) pag. 102. (e) pag. 119, 120. (f) pag. 124. (g) pag. 132.

SECT. 9. *examin'd and disprov'd.* 193  
"who were the Authors of this Division subject your selves to your  
*Presbyters.* Hence Observe First, that he never names, or so much as  
insinuates that in *Corinth* there was any Bishop Superintendent over  
the rest of the Pastors. But as the Apostle to the *Hebrews* had done be-  
fore him, honours equally all their Pastors with the Title of *ἐπισκοποι*  
*these that bear Rule over them.*

Secondly, That, in imitation of the same Apostle *Paul*, he names only  
Bishops and Deacons as the only Orders of Divine Institution, by whom  
the whole Gospel-Service was to be perform'd. Therefore afterward  
when he names *Presbyters* in distinction from the Flock and as Rulers o-  
ver it, he can't be understood (as *Petavins* and *Pearson* would force  
him) to speak of *Presbyters* with Relation and Respect only of their  
Age, but to give them this Demonstration as a peculiar Designation of a  
Church-Office; and so the word *Presbyter* most of necessity with *Cle-  
ment* coincide in its meaning with the word Bishop, and both of 'em be-  
come Synonymous Terms to hold forth but one and the same thing.

Thirdly, That the Apostles did not, as we find afterward Decreed by  
the Synod of *Sardica*, and admonish'd by Pope *Leo*, chuse out only the  
greater Cities, and neglect and forbear to place Bishops in lesser Villa-  
ges, that the name of Bishop hereby might not fall into Contempt, but  
indifferently and without distinction of places every where settled them  
according as there was a probability they might serve the great end of  
their calling therein.

Fourthly, That to found the Distinction and number of these Orders,  
if we believe *Clement*, the Apostles had no eye unto the *Jewish* Church-  
Polity, so as to make it a Pattern for that of the Christian, but only to  
what was prophesied and foretold by the Prophets concerning a new  
frame of the New Testament Church, and thus *Clement* really contra-  
dicts all the Patrons of the Hierarchy, who would still found their triple  
Orders on that of the High-Priest, Priests and Levites of the Temple.

Fifthly, That in *Corinth* it was attempted to throw out a plurality of  
real Bishops and cast them from their Charge, and that the Sedition was  
not moved against one only but divers Bishops in that Church. Many  
other things might be observed; but these serve sufficiently to prove  
that there was a plurality of true Bishops in *Corinth*, who were in nothing  
distinguished from Pastors of particular Flocks, or preaching Presby-  
ters.



§. 2. *Petavius* (*h*) notwithstanding can't abide any such Inference from the words of *Clement*. Wherefore he scrapes together several things whereby to ward off the force of these Passages: and alleges that *Clemens* his silence of the Bishop of Corinth makes nothing for us. For Pope *Siricius* (saith he) in his Epistle to the Church of Millain maketh no mention of their Bishop, altho' in that mean time *Ambrose* occupied the Chair. But the vast Difference between the Cases and the Circumstances of the Churches of Corinth and *Millain* quite nullifies the Jesuites Instance. The People of *Millain* jointly both Clergy and Laity had thrust out *Jovinian*, few or none of them (for ought we hear) being prosylited to his Doctrine: wherefore *Siricius* had nothing to do but shew them in General that he had excommunicated *Jovinian* with two or three others who had fled to *Rome* for Sanctuary. So there was no special Ground or Cause why particular mention should be made of *Ambrose* the Bishop, or any other, whether of the Clergy or Laity, the whole Body thereof, for ought now known, being without any Schism earnest enough for the expulsion of *Jovinian*, and only expecting what the Bishop of *Rome* which they acknowledged as the first See, and whether *Jovinian* had fled, would do in this Matter. Whereas, one the other hand, *Clemens* writes to a Church cut in pieces with a Schism in their own Bowels, infected with Sedition of no small part of the People against their Pastors, broken with (as appears plain) a division of the very Pastors themselves; and this grown to such a height, that some of the Pastors were thrust from their places, and driv'n out: now in this Case the Bishop had either the best of it; and so the seditious part merited a severe, and special reprimand on the account of their Opposition to, and Separation from their Bishop, and thus he should certainly have been mentioned: or else he was the Cause of the Division; or, at least, joined with the injurious, and therefore should have been particularly reprov'd or admonish'd. *Clement*, it's true, names none: but the influence which the good or evil Carriage the Bishop had, and could not but have in such a Matter, had certainly oblig'd *Clement* either to mention his name or give some signification of him, if there had been any Diocesan Bishop existent in *Corinth*. *Clemens* speaks of several Pastors of Flocks, which I think none will deny, intimates the diversity of their Carriage in that Business, and gives Directions accordingly. How can it

be apprehended that he should pass over the chief Pastor, and go to the rest without so much as the least Direction unto him, the least mention of him, yea or the least insinuation that there was, in *Corinth*, any such thing. *Petavius's* next Attempt is on these words of *Clement*, (i) where he tells that the *Apostles* instituted *Bishops* and *Deacons*. And the Jesuite contends, that two distinct Orders are not here mean'd, but that the word *Deacon* is only explicative of the former word *Bishop*, and cites several places where the word *Deacon* is taken in a signification of Honour, and applied to the *Apostles* and *Civil Magistrates*: And afterward terms *Salmasius* ridiculous, for saying that *Clemens* nam'd only *Bishops* and *Deacons* without mention of *Presbyters*. For (saith the Jesuite) *Presbyters* are more frequently mention'd by *Clement* than either *Bishops* or *Deacons*. But certainly these Orders are again and again mention'd by *Clement* without adding any thereto or detracting therefrom; when he appears to reckon up all the Church-Officers that are of Divine Institution. And altho' the word *Deacon* be sometimes taken for the Designation of a higher Office. Yet, as *Petavius* himself (k) else where observes, *It is with the addition of such a word or phrase as guides our Judgement, and gives us to learn that by it is not understood this lower Order of Church-Officers as Rom. 13. the Magistrate is called Διαικωνος or the Minister of God*. But there is no such explicative word or particle in *Clement* to alter the common Signification thereof, on which account we're not lightly to refuse therefrom. But that which utterly overthrows the Jesuite's Cause, is *Clement's* close Conformity to the *Apostle* in his account of Church-Orders, who *1 Tim. 1. 3.* beyond all Scruple of any Party, takes these words in the sense we plead for to *Clement*, and makes not at all the word *Deacon* exetick and explicative of the word *Bishop*: but by it designs a distinct Order of Church-Officers from what is signifi'd by the other. For doubtless *Clement Paul's* Fellow-Labourer took the words in the same signification and meaning, wherein the *Apostle* had understood them. And accordingly *Clement*, for Confirmation hereof, adduces the words of *Isaiah 60. 17.* which place, as he then certainly found it in the *Septuagint*, contains the words *Bishops & Deacons* exactly as *Paul* expresseth & distinguisheth Church-Officers: and on this Ground *Clement* goes when

(i) Page 98. (k) Appendice ad Hierar. Eccles. Lib. 2. Cap. 5. Si quidem Diaconus alias, idque passim, non propriè, sed appellativè sumitur: & tunc ferè aliad nomen in gi' nendi casu huic adjungitur &c.

he intimats that the Apostles in their Institution of Church-Officers had an eye to these words of the Prophet. In vain therefore labours *Petavius* to disprove the Copy of *Isaiah* used by *Clement*, and brings the Hebrew, *Hierome* and others taking the word in a different signification: for thus he hath not *Salmasius* or any other modern Defender of Presbytry but *Clement* himself, whom he pretends to vindicate, for his Adversary: seeing we Dispute not concerning the Greek Copy *Clement* used, but of the thing he inferr'd from these words of *Isaiah* according to the Copy he then cited. Neither is it more to the Jesuite's advantage that the word *Presbyter* is several times found in *Clement*. For seeing, as is plain, yea and the Jesuite himself not only grants but proves, that it frequently there denotes, not a degree of Age but a Church-Officer, it must of necessity be a Term altogether Synonymous with the word Bishop. For they themselves plead not for the Equipolency thereof with the word Deacon, wherein *Petavius* himself shall afford us no small assistance, who having, but to no purpose (seeing never Man denied it) shewed that with *Clement* the word *Presbyter* is sometimes taken appellatively, to denote old Age but no Church-Officer, subjoins these remarkable words; *At other times Clement so uses the word Presbyter as thereby to signify a certain Function and publick Office in the Ministry, and a certain Dignity in the Church, which he calls an Episcopacy or the Office of a Bishop.* From this plain Testimony of a Man in learning, and love to Prelacy, second to none that ever undertook its Defence, it's clear, as the Light it self, that with *Clement* the word *Bishop* and the word *Presbyter* when he takes it for a Church-Function, are Terms altogether Synonymous. For if *ἐπίσκοπον* *Episcopacy* or the Office of a *Bishop* be competent to *Clement's Presbyter*, and things as they ought, receive Denominations from Forms wherewith they're clothed, then this *Presbyter* in the Judgement of *Clement* is really a Bishop, and indeed this is superlatively clear to any, who, but with an open and unprepossess'd Mind reads the places of *Clement* we have already produced. Howbeit the Testimony of such an Adversary gives no small additional Confirmation to the Truth thereof. Yea the same Adversary in the same place acknowledges, that even then the Title of *Bishop* was also common, and in after times only appropriated to one. And again, It's clear (saith *Petavius*) from this place, that there was a Council or Ecclesiastick Senate ordain'd by the Apostles at Corinth; whose Dignity and Office *Clemens* calls *Episcopacy*, and the chiefeſt of the Clergy he

NAME

Sect. 9. *examin'd and disprov'd.* 197  
 names Presbyters, as also from this which Clement afterward writes. *It's base Beloved, yea most base &c.* And he names the same Presbyters Pastors and Church-Governours of the Christian Sheepfold. And now judge how the Jesuite after these Concessions could yet say, that it follows not from hence that in Corinth or at other Cities there was no peculiar Bishop.

§. 3. And here again we find D. M. (1) at his old filching Trade transcribing Petavins his Perversions of Clement, or bringing what is no more serviceable to either Cause or Credit: as that Clement comprehends all the Jewish Clergy under the name of Priests and Levites: Therefore (Inferre D. M.) It follows not from Clement his naming only Bishops and Deacons, that Bishops and Presbyters are not in Clement distinct Offices. But D. M. should remember that Clement not only Dichotomizes but Trichotomizes the Jewish Clergy into three Parts. But does he any where so divide the Christian Clergy? He not only names the two Kinds of Offices, but so names them as to identifie and take for one and the same Bishop and Presbyter: which Petavins and D. M. and their Brethren by all means labour to make him distinguish. But St. Clement (saith D. M.) exhorting the Corinthians to order sets before them the subordination under the Temple-Service, how the High-Priest, Priests, and Levites were distinguish'd by their proper Service, and immediately recommends to them, that every one of them should continue in his proper Order. Now (continues D. M.) when we consider the primitive Method of reasoning from Jewish precedents, St. Clement had never talked at this rate, if the Jurisdiction of one over many Priests had been abolished under the New Testament. But, why does he mutter, for it if he can bring ought for his purpose he must also Infer from this passage of Clement (m) that as there was a High-Priest over all the Jewish Church, so there must be another High-Priest over all Christians. And that all Christians must bring Oblations and Sacrifices to the Temple at Hierusalem: for from these Topicks does Clement exhort the Corinthians to Harmony. Whether then D. M. be a Romanist or a Jew may be a Question; for unquestionably his way of reasoning symbolizes with both of them. The Truth is, nothing can be inferr'd from this

(1) Page 44. Et seq. (m) Pages 94, and 96. τῷ γὰρ ἀρχιερεὶ ἰδίᾳ λειτουργεῖν δεδμέναι εἰσὶ καὶ τοῖς ἱερευσιν ἴδιος ὁ τύπος προστέτακται, καὶ λευίταις — Οὐ παντὶ γὰρ ἀδελφοί, προσφέρονται θυσιάαι ἐνδεδιέχουσιν, ἢ εὐχών, ἢ περ ἀμαρτίας καὶ πλημμελίας, ἀλλ' ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, ὡς καὶ ὁ ἐκ ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ προσφέρεται, ἀλλ' ἐμπροσθεν τοῦ ναοῦ πρὸς τὴν θυσιαστήριον ὄρε.

place of *Clement*, but that as under the Old Testament every one, whether Church-man or Laick, was to abide in his own Order without raising Schism or Confusion, so it ought to be under the New Testament. *St. Clement himself* (continues *D. M.*) distinguishes the *ἐπισκοπος* from the *πρεσβυτερος*. An express untruth, and I challenge *D. M.* and his Complices to prove it. Nor can it be (adds *D. M.*) an Objection of any weight, that the first who were their Spiritual Governours are mention'd in the plural number, since this was an Encyclical Epistle address'd to Corinth as the principal City, and from thence transmitted to its dependencies &c. By which words, if he speaks sense, he intimats that there were in the Apostolick age Metropolitan Cities in an Ecclesiastick sense, whose Bishops according to the Civil Dignity of these Cities were Metropolitan, and had their numbers of inferiour and dependent Bishops. A most nauseous and hatefull Hypothesis of some giddy Papaturians which, as we have heard, even the more candide of the Episcopalls, disclaim and explode.

I shall shut up all concerning *Clement* with the Suffrages of two illustrious Names, neither whereof, I'm sure, did ever favour Presbytry: I mean *Grotius* and *Stillingfleet*. Had Episcopacy (saith the Doctor (n)) been instituted on the occasion of the Schism at Corinth, certainly of all places, we should the soonest have heard of a Bishop at Corinth for the remedying of it; and yet almost of all places, these Heralds that derive the Succession of Bishops from the Apostles times, are the most plunged whom to fix on at Corinth. And they that can find any one single Bishop at Corinth at the time when *Clement* writ his Epistle to them (about another Schism as great as the former, which certainly had not been according to their Opinion, if a Bishop had been there before) must have better Eyes and Judgement, than the deservedly admired *Grotius*, who brings this in his Epistle to *Bignonius* as an Argument of the undoubted Antiquity of that Epistle, quod nusquam meminit exfortis &c. that *Clement* no where mentions, that singular Authority of Bishops which by Church custome after the Death of *Mark* at Alexandria, and by its Example in other places began to be introduced, but *Clement* clearly shews as did the Apostle *Paul*, that then by the common Council of the Presbyters who both by *Paul*, and *Clement* are called Bishops, the Churches were governed.

§. 4. I proceed next to the Vindication of *Polycarp*. Subject your selves (saith he (o)) to the Presbyters and Deacons as to God and Christ,

(n) *Iren.* page 279. (o) Epist. ad *Philipp*.

and

and, as Virgins, walk with a pure Conscience, let the Presbyters be simple or innocent, mercifull in all things, turning all Men from their Errors, visting all who are weak, not neglecting widows, Orphans, and those that are Poor, but alwayes providing such things as are good in the sight of God and Men. Here we learn that the highest Office then in the Church of Philippi was that of a Presbyter, and that there was a Plurality to whom the Philippians were to be subjected without the least mention of a particular Bishop governing those Presbyters. And, which deserves no overly Consideration, we here see that as, when Clement gives an account of Church Orders, he named two only, so we have the same number expressed by Polycarp, but they altered their Denomination of the former Order, and they whom Clement calls sometimes Bishops, sometimes Presbyters, Polycarp calls still Presbyters. It's most observable also, how both Paul and Polycarp subject the Church of one single City Philippi to a Plurality or Multitude of Pastors, whom Paul calls Bishops, and Polycarp Presbyters. From all which the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter most inevitably results.

§. 5. And indeed this Passage of Polycarp so much gravells the Hierarchicks, that Dr. Pearson is driven to his last Leggs, and compelled to present us with a shift unworthy of its Author. Who can prove (saith he (p)) that the Bishop of Philippi was then alive, who can shew us, that the Philippians asked not Counsel at Polycarp, for this cause, that they then enjoyed not a Bishop, for thus Polycarp bespeaks them. These things Brethren, I write not of myself to you concerning righteousness, but you have moved me therunto. Thus Pearson, and indeed it's enough here to return the Question inverted, who is able to prove, if there had been a Bishop in Philippi, that he was not alive? For seeing he affirms it, he or his Advocats are obliged to instruct what they say. That which he pretends to from these words of the Epistle wherein Polycarp saith he was moved thereby the Philippians themselves, affords him not the least support; there not being therein one syllable concerning the vacancy of the Bishops Seat or the Church Government during this Defect; or how to fill the Chair. Of all or any of these *nec vola nec vestigium*, but only (as is evident from Polycarp) they seem to have desired of him some Direction concerning the blameless walk of any Christian. And indeed, the Bi-

(p) Vind. Ignat. Part. 2. Page 168. *Sed quis dabit Episcopum Philippensium tunc in vivis fuisse? Quis prastabit Philippenses &c.*

shop



shop within a very few lines fairly yeelds the Cause, really acknowledging that he had said nothing to the purpose. *But seeing* (saith he) *these things are uncertain, we have no certainty from the Discourse of Polycarp.* Well then, it must follow, for ought he knew, that Polycarp knew no Diocesan Bishop in *Philippi*, that he had never heard of his Death, seeing nothing hereof can be gathered from him. And that he had never heard of his Life or Being, we may well conclude from this, that he devolves the whole Church-Affairs upon a Plurality of Presbyters. But once again; Is it at all credible, but that if Polycarp had written to the *Philippians* after the death of their Bishop and during the vacancy of the Chair, he had comforted them after this so considerable a Loss, and giv'n them Directions for chusing of a worthy Successor, especially if [ as *Pearson* would have ] they had ask'd his counsell concerning this very Matter? Had ever a Pastor like Polycarp neglected so seasonable an Office? His profound silence therefore of the Death of any such Bishop in *Philippi* sufficiently demonstrats that this Dr. *Pearson's* Invention was only the product of a desperate Cause, and that there was left here no doore of Escape.

And here let me observe that *Philippi* is no less fatal to the Episcopals, than its neighbouring plains were to the *Pompeians*: for they are stung and confounded with the very first words of *Paul* to that Church, and, as we have heard, amongst their other wild shifts, they answer *that the Bishop was often absent.* But there was a good number of years between the writing of *Paul* and that of *Polycarp* to the *Philippians*, and yet we see the Bishop is never come home; *Why tarryeth the wheel of his Lordship's Chariot?* Hath he not sped at Court? And having supplanted some of the Nobility, made a prey of the Office of Chancellor or Treasurer, that after so long absence there is no news of his return? Nor are we ever like to hear any more of him, for now [ say they ] *he's dead*: I had perhaps believ'd them, were't not impossible for one to die who was never alive. But enough of this; for such Answers would really tempt one to think that their Authors studi'd nothing more than to ridicule their own Cause and afford Game to their Reader.

§. 6. And here I cann't but notice the ill-grounded vapouring of D. *M.* who ( *q* ) from the inscription of the Epistle ( *Polycarp and the Presbyters that are with him* ) concludes that *he was vested with Episcopal*

( *q* ) pag. 49. & seq.

*jurisdiction*

*jurisdiction and eminency amongst these Presbyters.* And so much he pretends to bring out of *Blondel* as his forc'd Confession, which is so far from being true, that it's brought in by *Blondel* as an Objection and silly Conjecture of the Episcopals, which he (r) diverse ways overthrows. And indeed never was there a more wretch'd deduction fram'd, seeing, as *Blondel* at large shews, the phrase natively yealds only this sense viz. *Polycarp and the rest of the Presbyters of that Colledge.* And thus D. M. may as well infer *Peter's* Superiority and Power over the rest of the Apostles from *Acts* 2. 37. *To Peter and to the rest of the Apostles.* Moreover *Blondel* demonstrats how, on diverse accounts, *Polycarp* without any Eminency and Power over the rest may be particularly nominated rather than others; as, because he was first in Order and Years. But I insist not herein, but refer to *Blondel* who hath nervously baffl'd this their pitifull Conjecture. D. M. adventures to ingage with nothing of what he saith, and yet is not asham'd to bring to the Field so blunted a weapon. I pass also D. M's two Arguments for *Polycarp's* Diocesan Episcopacy, drawn from the pretended Succession of Diocesan Bishops in *Smyrna*, and the Epistles of *Ignatius* mention'd by *Polycarp*, having overthrown both of 'em already, and proceed to the Testimony of *Hermas* who (f) thus speaks: *Thou shalt write two Books, thou shalt send one to Clement and one to Graptes, and Clement shall send it to foreign Cities; for to him this is permitted: and Graptes shall admonish the Widows and Orphans, but thou shalt read it with, or relate it unto the Presbyters in this City who govern the Church.* Where we see that not any one Bishop, but a Colledge of Presbyters (call'd, doubtless, afterward by the same Author, Bishops) govern'd the Church of one City. Yet D. M. pretends to find here a palpable Evidence of Episcopacy; For (saith he (t)) *the sending of the Encyclical Epistle to foreign Cities is insinuated to be the peculiar Priviledge of Clement then Bishop of Rome.* But if he conclude from this place of *Hermas* that *Clement* had any Power over these to whom he was to send that Book or Epistle (as for *Clement's* being Bishop of *Rome* it's so far from being insinuated here, that the quite contrary is from this very place most evident) he may as well infer from *Col.* 4. 16. that they had Power over the *Laodiceans* whither they were to send, and cause to be read the Apostle's Letter.

(r) Apolog. prosent. Hieron. pag. 14. & seq. (f) Lib. 1. Vif. 2. (t) pag. 53. & seq.

Secondly, D. *M.* ascribing to the Bishop of *Rome* Power over foreign Cities, erects a Pope rather than a Bishop. But I'll assure him he came not in so early: for seeing there was undoubtedly one Bishop (at least) in every particular City so soon as there were any in the World, this place of *Hermas* (if it bear D. *M.*'s Inference and give a Power to *Clement* over foreign Cities) insinuates nothing of a Bishop's Dignity above Presbyters, but of the power of one Bishop over another or rather of a Pope over other Churches. A falsehood most unanimously exploded by *Cyprian*, *Jerome*, *Augustine*, and the rest of the Ancients D. *M.* seeks also for his Prelacy in the words of *Hermas* viz. (u) *The Earthly Spirit exalts itself and seeks the first seat.* (x) *Some contend for Principality and Dignity.* But what if *Hermas* had said that some contended to get an Empire and Poppedome over the whole Church; would D. *M.* hence conclude that it was lawfull or then practised in the Church, or when the Apostles contended who should be the greatest? Had Christ before that time assured them of the lawfulness of such an Office, and told them, that they were to have one to be a Prince over the rest? By no Logic therefore can it be inferred for *Hermas* his words that a chief Seat or Principality (for both are one and the same with *Hermas*) was then either exercised or held lawfull. Again, tho' both had been then in Custome, no Power of one over the rest can be hence concluded; seeing the chief Seats are given to the Moderators of Synods and other Presidents of Assemblies, who have no primacy of Power but only of Order. And again (y) *The polished and white Stones (saith Hermas) are the Apostles, and Bishops, and Doctors, and Deacons, who walked in the Clemency of God, and exercised the Office of a Bishop, and taught and served.* And, (z) *Such are some Bishops, that is Governors of the Churches, and these who have the Charge of the Services.*

§. 7. "In both places (saith *Blondel*) he makes only two Degrees "that of the Bishops who governed the Churches, and that of the Deacons who had the charge of the Services, for it's acknowledged by "all that the Doctors are all one with the Bishops, when they are said "to have performed the Office of a Bishop, and that the Apostles as "they are opposed to Bishops, were placed above the whole Clergy. "This (reponds D. *M.*) is Tergiversation with a Witness, and a frau-

(u) Lib. 2. Mand. 12. (x) Lib. 3. Simil. 8. (y) Lib. 1. Vis. 3. (z) Lib. 3. Simil. 9.

"dulent Trick in *Blondel*, since Presbyters in the primitive Church are frequently distinguished by the Name of *Doctors*: and *Blondel's* Commentary is a manifest violence offered to the Text, for Doctors are not said to have performed the Office of a Bishop but to have taught: and this is very agreeable to their Character, being so much employ'd by their respective Bishops in teaching the *Catechumens*; and the natural position of these words will allow of no other meaning. Which Answer D. *M.* hath learned from the Practice of our late Bishops, during whose *Epocha* the Buffund might have hid himself well nigh the whole year from the Bishop's fury in the Bishop's pulpit, seeing he scarce ever came thither to play the Doctor or ought else. As for the Ancient and true primitive Bishops, they perpetually preach'd or taught (saith *Le Moyn* (a)) Moreover the Fathers generally take Pastor, Bishop, and Doctor for one and the same as *Chrysostome*, *Theophylact*, *Theodore*, *Sedulius*; and after them, *Aquinas*, *Haymo*, *Benedictus Justinianus* with others on *Ephes. 4. 11.* Of the same mind are *Hierome*, *Augustine* and *Anselm* (b), and the pretended *Clemens Romanus* cited by *Gratian* and *Benedictus Justinianus*, and the Fathers of the Council of *Carthage*. Of the same Mind are the ablest of our Bishops, as *Field*, *Hammond* and *Heylen* (c) So truly did *Blondel* say that Bishop and Doctor is universally taken for one and the same. Neither was ever the *Presbyter* either in *Cyprian* or any other Ancient, called Doctor in opposition to the Bishop but to other Ecclesiastick Presbyters, who taught not, of whose existence, as was before touched, we have most sufficient assurance. But D. *M.* in contradiction to the Apostle would have a Bishop who is no Teacher or Preacher, like the Droll who said, he mett with Priests who were no Clerks. And seeing with *Hermas* there are but two Orders of Church-men, and Bishops, and *presides Ecclesiarum* Church Governours are reciprocal Terms taken for one and the same: and seeing that his Presbyters are expressly term'd Church-Governours; it's most evident that he takes Bishop and Presbyter for one and the same, and that the word Doctor is purely exegetick or explicative of the word Bishop, and that both of them, which I'm sure is not unfrequent in all sorts of Authors, evidently signifie one and the same thing.

(a) *Varia sacra.* Page 34. (b) Apud Corn. a Lapide in *Eph. 4. 11.*  
(c) History of Episcopacy, Part 2. Page 39.

§. 8. Inow proceed to *Justine Martyr* who (d) thus gives an account of the state of the Churches their particular and weekly Assemblies for receiving the Word and Sacraments. "After this, Bread and Wine tempered with Water is brought to the Ruler or Governour of the Brethren, which when he hath received, he gives praise and glory to the Parent of all ----- The Deacons give to all present Bread and Wine tempered with Water after they are Consecrated by Thanks-giving, and carry them to such as are absent. And on Sunday all who live either in Cities or in the Country come together into one place ----- And when the Reader has ceas'd, the Governour makes an exhortatory Sermon ----- The voluntary Contribution is laid up with the Governour who distributes it to the Orphans &c. Where it's not only observable that *Justine* following not the pretended *Ignatius* but the *Apostle*, *Clement*, *Polycarp*, *Hermas*, mentions only two Orders of Church-men, viz. Governours and Deacons, but also that he gives a *Προεσβς* or Bishop to every Congregation, and that *Justine's* *Προεσβς* is all one with the Bishop who was then in being is yealded by the fiercest Hierarchicks, *Heylen* (e) who yeelds his whole Plea and says that *Justine's* President of the Congregation, or Bishop, ordinarily celebrated the Eucharist and Preach'd God's holy Word; and *Maurice* (f). Well then, 'tis all one how this ancient Chnrch-Ruler be named, whither Presbyter, Governour, or Bishop, seeing there was one for every Congregation that mett for receiving the word and Sacraments, the Controversy between us and the Hierarchicks, which is not about Names but Things, is fully ended if they stand to *Justine's* Decision.

§. 9. Dr. *Maurice* would have *Justine* to be understood as speaking only of the Diocesan Bishops Church. For (saith he) to carry the Bread and Wine to all absents in their severall Duellings, was not convenient nor easy in numerous Congregations, and they knew not well who were absent. But this Perversion is too wretch'd & palpable to wheedle any in in his right wit out of *Justine's* plain Meaning. Dr. *Maurice* knew well enough that in these times of such Fervor and Love among Christians, and such Veneration for the Lord's Supper, they doubtless most exactly observ'd the Ordinances, and absented not without speciall and weighty

(d) Apolog. ad Antoninum Pium. "Επειτα προσβιβεται τῷ πρεσβυτέρῳ ὁ ἱεὺς ἁπλοῦς ἄρτος, καὶ πολὺν ὕδωτος καὶ κραύματος ὄντος. (e) Hist. of Episcopacy, part 2. pag. 39. (f) Defence of Diocesan Episcopacy pag. 39.

Causes. And seeing the Custome of receiving the Elements at home, when they could not come to Church was then in vigour, and believed to be their Duty (if these Elements were given to Absents as their proper Communion, or were only the *εὐλογισαί* the last remains of the Custume of the *αγάπαι* the Love Feasts, I now dispute not) they took special care to signify their Absence and Causes thereof, by their Relations or Christian Brethren to their Deacons, and such as were concerned to know it. Neither, if we consider the Church-Discipline of these times, is it to be doubted that the Deacons had an exact List of all to whom they were each Lords Day to give the Sacrament, and consequently by no means could be ignorant who were either absent or present. Wherefore, tho' the Deacons had been fewer than they were, they could easily, tho' the whole Congregation had been never so numerous, carry the Elements to these very few whom sickness or other lawfull and weighty Reasons had confined to their Habitations: all which Dr. *Maurice* well enough perceived; and therefore he's here no less feeble in his Actings than a man breathing his last, and advances only such trifles as may make his Friends ashamed and confirm his Adversaries. Neither do I wonder hereat, seeing he undertook the Defence of a palpable untruth: for not only speaks *Justine* of the Christian Assemblies in common without the least exception, but clearly tells us that he speaks of the meetings of all the Christians for receiving the Word and Sacraments, not only in Cities, but in the Country a place too base for the Cathedral and Diocesan Bishops Chair, and of all such Congregations, as in the first day of the Week, as the Apostle speaks, made Collections or had Deacons for that end, which belongs to every Congregation where the Word and Sacraments are dispensed. Neither is this ought but what we have discover'd to be the Mind of their *Ignatius* himself, and seconded with the Suffrages of the greatest Friends to Prelacy.

§. 10. Wherefore most vain is D. *M's* (g) Labour to prove that it follows not from *Justine* that there were then only two Orders of Church-men. Seeing *Justine* giving a Governour or Bishop to every Congregation, quite overturns Diocesan Episcopacy. And more vain yet is this, that as, what he undertakes tho' proved is nothing to his purpose, so the Reasons he brings prove nothing of what he undertakes. For his first



Reason, viz. *That Justine intended only to give a true account of what was ordinarily performed in the Christian Meetings in opposition to the abominable Stories propagated against them by their Enemies, so that he had no occasion to reckon up the several Gradations of the Hierarchy, is equally favourable to Prelatists and Papists, who may as well use it for a Sanctuary to their Pope as they to their Prelats. And indeed had there then either been a Pope over all or a Prelate with Princely Power as D. M. pleads for over a multitude of Churches, the Christians seeing they were frequently reproached with an intended Rebellion, had found themselves obliged in a special manner to apologize for their Princes and absolute Lords, who would have been looked on as little less than the Emperour's Rivalls and Arch-Promoters and Heads of the supposed Insurrection. Moreover, which we have already noted, and fully shews the nullity of D. M's Reason, not only Justine but all the genuine Writings of them that went before him, mention only, like Justine, these two Orders of Church-men.*

*D. M's second Reason, viz. That the Christians were most sly to publish any thing relating either to the Mysteries of their Religion or the Constitution of the Church, more than was absolutely necessary in their own Defence &c. is another lurking place for Romanists when urg'd to shew the Antiquity of their Innovations: and indeed if it do any thing, it tends to prove that no Party can make any Advantage of ought spoken or written by the Fathers; and if so, have at the Foundation of Diocesan Prelacy, its prime Advocats acknowledging that no Argument for it can be draun from Scripture, but only from the writings of the Fathers.*

*His third Reason is, that as the Offices, so the names of Bishop and Presbyter were not only known to be distinguished in his days among the Christians (but he brings no genuine Writer of that Age to prove this, and that it is most false is already evinced) but even the Heathens knew so much: and cites Adrian's Epistle to Servianus: but it's highly probable that the Emperour if we allow him any knowledge of these Affairs, understands under the name of Presbyters the very same Officers, the very same Men, that he means by the name Bishops, rather than e contra: see Pray the Letter it self apud Flav. Vopis, in Saturnino.*

§. II. 'Twere easie to shew divers succeeding Fathers to have been of Justine's Mind and Strangers to Diocesan Episcopacy, ignoring all Discrimination between Bishop and preaching Presbyter or Pastor. I shall

shall only here with one Chamber (b) against Bellarmine and the rest of the Jesuites, assert against their Successors and Defenders under whatever Name they be known, that according to Irenæus the Churches were committed to the Presbyters, no less than to the Bishops, that these who are now reckoned Popes, High-Priests, universal Bishops, are only Presbyters in the Judgement of Irenæus: and that in him Presbyters are not so much as once distinguished, and far less separated from Bishops. From what is said, appears the vanity of D. M's Popish Query. (i) Whether (all things duly considered) a more evident and universal Tradition for the Superiority and Jurisdiction of a Bishop above a Presbyter, can be reasonably demanded; and whether the Argument from universal Tradition, be not in this Case the most proper and most necessary? And whether the Tradition for the Superiority of a Bishop above a Presbyter, be not more universal, unanimous and uncontradicted, in the Primitive Ages, than many other Traditions that are unquestionably received? What these his other Traditions are, we are not ignorant. The Doctrine certainly of the morality of the Sabbath, of Baptism, and of the Holy Trinity, and the like; these they \* think lean only on Tradition, and that the Institution of their Diocesan Prelats, Metropolitans, and Arch-Prelats, and other such Effects and Inventions of a degenerating and apostatizing Church, are better founded than these most Scriptural Catholick and necessary Doctrines.

(b) Paustratiæ Tom. 2. Lib. 10. Cap. 6. Denique ausim asserere nunquam ab Episcopis distingui, nedum separari Presbyteros apud Irenæum. (i) Pages 158, 159.

\* Vide Petavium de Hierarchia Eccl. Lib. 1. and D. Taylor Episcopacy asserted.

## Section X.

### *Other Observations and Arguments every way of Diocesan Prelacy.*

AND now in the next place, I would gladly learn how they will describe, or whereon they can found their Romish, or, which is all one, their Hierarchick Diocesan Bishop. For as Augustine (a) well

(a) well observes, it is a name of Labour and Travel, not of Honour and Dignity: and indeed, it imports only Watchfullness, Labour and Care as its most native and proper Signification; and on this account, only the King gets the name of Bishop in Hesychius (b) as he gets the name of Pastor in Homer (c). And Hesychius gives it no less to every Watchman. Thus the word Bishop denotes a vigilant Watchman in Suidas (d) where he tells us that some bearing this Name were sent by the Athenians to observe the Affairs of their subject Cities who were called Watchmen. So is the same word understood to denote only Care and Labour by Julius Pollux (e) whereas, on the other hand, the word Presbyter when taken for a Function or Office, natively imports Rule and Honour (f). A Presbyter (acknowledges even Saravia (g)) is a Name of Honour, and was given to the more honourable, and to the Magistrats among the Jews in the Old Testament, and was thence transferred to signify the Governours of the Churches of Christ in the New Testament, but they are called Bishops from their watchfull Care which is a Name of Work and Labour. The name Presbyter (saith Dr. Stillingfleet (h)); as the Hebrew ZAKEN tho' it originally import Age, yet by way of connotation it hath been looked on as a Name both of Dignity and Power among the Jews, in the times of the Apostles, it is most evident that the Name πρεσβυτεροι imported not only Dignity but Power; the Presbyters among the Jews having Power both of Judging and Teaching given them by their Semicha or Ordination. Now under the Gospel the Apostles retaining the Name, and the manner of Ordination, but not conferring that judiciary Power by it, which was in use among the Jews, to shew the Difference between the Law and the Gospel, it was requisite some other Name should be given to the Governours of the Church, which should qualifie the importance of the word Presbyters to a sense proper to a Gospel state; which was the Original of giving the Name επιστατοι to the Governours of the Church under the Gospel; a Name importing Duty more than Honour, and not a title above Presbyter, but rather used by way of Diminution and Qualification of the Power imply'd in the name of Presbyter &c. The Hierarchicks therefore should act much more rationally if they turn'd the Tables, and gave the name of Presbyter to their Diocesan, and that of the Bishop to their inferior Curats, who usually do most of the Pastoral Work. In the

(a) De civitate Dei. Lib. 19. Cap. 19. Exponere voluit quid sit Episcopatus: quia nomen est operis non honoris &c. (b) Ad vocem. (c) Iliad. 2. (d) Ad vocem. (e) Lib. 3. Cap. 21. (f) Suidas ad vocem, & Hesychius ad vocem. (g) Saravia de diversis gradibus. Cap. 9. (h) Iren. Pages 285, and 286.

mean while it's sure from what we just now learned out of these Authors that during sounder Antiquity, before men equally abused Names and Things, a Bishop could never be either an Order or Degree or any thing else above a Presbyter.

But from Names if we pass to things, and look into Scripture and sounder Antiquity, we shall find the ancient Bishop so different from the present Diocesan, that the very *Ideas* and notions of the two are diametrically opposite one to another. The Apostles themselves *Acts* 6. 2, 4. following the Commandment of their Master, found it their Duty so assiduously to labour in Preaching and Prayer that they thought it unreasonable to be diverted even by the Distribution of the Collections, and Care of the Poor, which otherwayes was a Work both lawfull and pious. And to *Timothy*, who, if we believe the Hierarchicks, was an Arch-Bishop of a vast Diocess, it's injoynd as his proper Task to Preach the Word, to be instant in season and out of season, to reprove, to rebuke, exhort with all Long-suffering and Doctrine. I need not here multiply Texts; read and read over again the whole New Testament, and you shall find that the Exercise of Prayer, Dispensing the Word and Sacraments was the main Duty and perpetual Employment of every Pastor or Minister of Christ. Look, on the other hand, to the bulk of the Hierarchick Lord-Bishops, they have a quite different Work and Exercise, and if any of 'em happen to spend sometime in the Ministerial Duties how are they commonly gaz'd on and deprecated as Men of extraordinary Condescension, superlatively stuping to a piece of Service far below the Episcopal Grandeur and unusual to the Order? Are they not then quite another thing than the Apostolick and Scripturall Bishops?

This Apostolick Example the Conscientious Primitive Bishops or Pastors closely follow'd; not so much as once dreaming that any who was ordain'd a Minister of the Gospell, and intrusted with a Flock, might on whatsoever pretext neglect to exercise himself perpetually in Prayer and Dispensing the Word and Sacraments. This they judg'd his constant Employment, and this was the Practice of all the sincere Bishops even after the Distinction of Degrees was introduc'd, as appears in the weekly and sometimes the dayly Homilies and Lectures of *Chrysostome* and *Augustine* which are yet extant. And it's already observed how *Hilary* makes the Bishop a sedulous Dispenser of the Words of su-

210 *The Fundamentals of the Hierarchy* Part II.  
 ture Life. And indeed all the Hierarchick Grandeur and Domination whereby a Bishop was intirely Metamorphosed into a quite other thing than what he had once been, could never notwithstanding obliterate and blot out of thinking Mens Minds the true Scriptural Notion and Idea thereof. *The Episcopal Dignity consists in Teaching* (saith Balsamon (i)). And the fourth Council of Carthage decrees that a Bishop shall not be employed in caring for his household Affairs, but shall wholly occupy himself in Reading and Praying, and Preaching the Word (k).

§. 12. 'Twere endless to alledge all that may be produc'd to this purpose; neither could any Man who ever seriously read the Bible have any other Notion of a true Bishop than what is common to every Pastor of a Congregation; seeing the Apostle's Description of a Bishop 1 Tim. 3. and Tit. 1. agrees equally to all of them. And here it's observable, that still where Bishops are spoken of in Scripture, not only is the Work and Office which is injoin'd them, that of Teaching and Feeding, but also the Name is correlative to the Flock, and not to a Company of Clergy-men, as Acts 20. 28. *Take heed to yourselves, and to all the Flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made you Overseers or Bishops* ἐπισκοποις to Feed the Church of God. 1 Pet. 5. 2. *Feed the Flock of God which is among you*, taking the oversight thereof or Bishoping it ἐπισκοπῆντες; and accordingly, as we have oftner than once demonstrated, over every particular Congregation there was a Bishop.

This Assertion may be strongly confirmed from the undoubted Practice of the Church in the fourth Century, even when she was fall'n into no small Declension from the Primitive Purity. For the Council of Sardica Decrees (l) that a Bishop may not be placed in a Village or small Town where one Presbyter may suffice. Dr. Maurice (m) says that this Canon is justified by the Arians their great multiplication of Bishops to strengthen their Party. But the Council it self assigns a quite different Ground that moved them to make this Decree, viz. that the Name and Authority of a Bishop fall not into Contempt. Where we see the Design of abolishing the Primitive and Apostolick Custome of giving a Bishop indifferently to every Congregation, whether in City or in Countrey,

(i) In Can. Apost. 58. τὸ ἐπισκόπικον ἀξίωμα διδωσκαλίον ἐστὶ. (k) Caranza summa Con. folio 118. Can. 20. (l) Can. 6. μὴ ἐξῆναι δὲ ἀπλῶς καθεστάν ἐπίσκοπον κομην πνὶ ἢ βραχέα πολει, ἢ πνὶ καὶ ὡς μόνος πρεσβύτερος ἐπερεῖ ἐκ ἀναγκῆς ὅδ ἐπισκόπος ἐκείν καὶ πνὶ, ἵνα μὴ κατ' ἐπιτελείηται τὸ τῷ ἐπισκόπῳ δομα καὶ ἡ αὐθεντία. (m) Page 67.

was the Introduction of a secular Pomp and Grandeur into the Church, which finally resolv'd into a Papal Slavery. However, this *Sardinian* Canon had not so good effect, but that, about twenty years after, a new Sanction thereto was found needfull: for the Council of *Laodicea* (n) Decrees that it shall not be lawfull to place Bishops in little Villages or Countrey Places, but only Visitors, and that the Bishops who were already placed in these little Villages and Countrey Places, should for the future do nothing without the knowledge of the Bishop of the City.

Mark, how a pace the mild and fraternal Church Regimen is turn'd into a Worldly Domination and Dignity to pave the way for a papal Tyranny. These rural Bishops or Countrey-parish Pastors (for they can be call'd nothing else) whom Dr. *Beverige* (o) acknowledges for real and true Bishops, were also assaulted, and the subjecting and enslaving of them to the Prelates and Clergy in the greater Cities, design'd by other Councils as that of *Ancyrum* (p), and of *Neocesarea* (q), and of *Antioch* (r), there they are called *Chorepiscopi* i.e. Countrey Bishops. And it has been disputed if these were real & true Bishops. But the same Dr. *Beverige* not only yeelds, but at large pleads for the Affirmative (s). He pretends in the mean while "that anciently Bishops were ordain'd in Cities only, many whereof had according to the model of the Empire, such ample Territories that 'twas impossible for the Bishop of the City his alone to visit and sufficiently to guide them, and so it seem'd needfull for such Bishops to have, according to the amplitude of their Bishopricks, one or two Coajutors in some Region without the City, who might disburden them of some parts of the Episcopal Function, which could not be done but by some consecrated Bishops. Hence 'twas that some of these great Bishops Ordain'd, in some part of their large Provinces, these Bishops, but with this provision, that these without their leave should do nothing of moment, seeing these Regions also belonged to the Care of the City Bishop, which we learn, (continues he) from the tenth Canon of the Council of *Antioch*, where it's expressly Decreed, that no Countrey Bishop Or-

(n) Can. 56. ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις καὶ ἐν ταῖς γούραις καθίστασθαι ἐπισκοπὸν ὄχι. (o) On the 56 or 57 Canon of *Laodicea*. Ergo ante hoc ex γούραις etiam revera Episcopi constituti sunt. (p) Can. 13. (q) Can. 14. (r) Can. 10. [s] On the 13 Canon of the Council of *Ancyrum*. Quibus etiam consecrare non dubitamus veteros Chorepiscopos, — revera Episcopos fuisse — Enimvero cum Episcopi in Civitatibus solum antiquitus ordinati fuerint &c.



"dain Presbyter or Deacon without the Bishop of the City, to which, he and his Region is subject. But indeed there's no such thing, to be learn'd from that Canon, it only says (x) *that the Chorepiscopus and his Region was subject to the City* (as they really were in a Civil Sense) not to the Bishop of the City: and tho' they had said so it's no proof of his Conclusion, seeing they usually pretended Antiquity for the greatest Innovations. How far either in, or nigh to the Time of the Apostles the Church was from giving to the Bishop such a Princely Dignity as he pretends, or from allowing him to do the Work proper to himself by substitute Vassals, none acquainted with what remains of these Ancient times can be ignorant, and is already oftner then once evinc'd. And now I'm sorry to find a Protestant of sence and Learning lean on that shamefull and most exploded Falshood, viz. that the Apostles took the Government of the Empire for their Pattern of Church-Government; and daring to publish such gross Falshoods whereof even the more ingenuous Romanists are ashamed.

"The Ecclesiastical Degrees (saith *Slave* (u)) were not Originally Instituted as Dignities, Preheminencies, Rewards, or Honours, as now they are, and have been, many hundred years, but with Ministry, and Charges, otherwise called by St. Paul, Works, and those that exercise them, are called by Christ our Lord in the Gospel, Workmen; and therefore no Man could then enter into cogitation to absent himself from the Execution thereof in his own Person: and if any one (which seldom happend) retired from the Work, 'twas not thought reasonable, he should have either Title or Profit. And tho' the Ministries were of two sorts, some Anciently called, as now they are, with care of Souls: others of temporal things, for the sustenance and service of the Poor and Sick, as were the Deaconries, and other inferiour Works, all held themselves equally bound to that Service, in Person; neither did any think of a substitute, but for a short time, and for great Impediments, much less to take another Charge, which might hinder that.

§. 13. And now to go on, these Countrey Bishops or Pastors could not yet by all these Councils be Un-bishoped. And therefore Pope *Damasus* must next fall on them, and authoritatively define (x) *that they*

[x] *ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἱερωσύνη, ἢ ὑποκείμενος αὐτὸς τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ.*  
[u] History of the Council of Trent. Page 216. Et seq. [x] Garanza Fol. 100. &c.

were stark nought in the Church, their Institution wicked and contrary to the holy Canons. And thus he acted suitably to his purpose, seeing the enslaving the lesser and Country Churches to the Domination of these of the greater Cities made fair way for subjecting all to Rome, which on many Accounts was greater than any of the rest. He also hereby gratified and much obliged the Bishops of these great Cities who were desirous of nothing more than of Domination, and accordingly they even at these times were giving him their mutual help for raising of the Papal Throne, yea before the time of *Damasus* this same Council of *Sardica*, which thought it too vile and base for a Bishop to Dwell out of a great City, Deereed also (y) *That if any Bishop thought he was injured in any Cause by his Comprovincials and ordinary Judges, it should in this Case be lawfull for him to appeal to the Bishop of Rome. Let us honour (say they) the Memory of St. Peter, that either these who examined the Matter or other neighbouring Bishops write to Julius Bishop of Rome, and if he think it fit then let the Matter be tried and judged again, and let him appoint Judges for the Purpose, but if he approve of what's already done, and think not fit to call it in-to Question, then the things already done shall be accounted firm and stable.* Thus these Fathers, many whereof otherwise were excellent Men, the first, I think, that ever gave such Deference and Authority to the Pope, 'twas not therefore incongruous that both of these Decrees should proceed from one and the same Council.

Hence it's to be noted, that the Tympany of these times had not only exerted it self in separating the things God had conjoin'd, and in an holygarchick Confinement of the Power God had given equally to all Pastors, unto a few whom they named *Bishops*, a Name also equally belonging to all Christ's Ministers; but also in subjecting of the Presbyters, yea and even the Bishops of the Countrey to the very Presbyters of the City (z) but much more the Bishops or Pastors of the Countrey to the Bishops of the Cities, and these again to the Bishops of the greater Metropolitan Cities, and so on till at length (not to name the rest of the higher and lower roundles of this Hierarchick Ladder) all centred in *Rome*.

Yet in these very times it was notwithstanding firmly rooted in Mens

(y) Can. 3. Πίστες τῆ ἀποστολικῆς μνήμης πιστῶν, καὶ παραδείκτας ὅτι τὰς αὐτῶν ἐκείνων τῶν ἱερῶν ἐπιστολῶν παύσης, ἐπιγινώσκοντες αὐτὸς τὰ παλαιότερα. (z) Neocesar. Can. 13. & Ancyrum. Can. 13.

Minds that whosoever dispensed the Word and Sacraments, and had a Flock or Congregation was a true Bishop, as I have made out to be the mind of *Hilary*, and many others of the fourth and fifth Centuries. Moreover *Optatus* asserts (a) that *Preaching or Exposing is the proper Province of a Bishop*. But, to proceed, these *Chorepiscopi*, or Countrey Bishops of Parish Pastors were in the third Century called absolutely Bishops at the Countrey Places or Villages; so speaks the Council of *Antioch*, *He* (say these Fathers) i. e. *Paulus Samosatenus* (b) *suborn'd the Bishops of the neighbouring Countrey Villages and Towns, as also Presbyters his Flatterers to praise him in their Homilies*. Dr. Maurice (c) answers that it appears not hence that these were Parish Bishops for *Chorepiscopi* had many Congregations. As if these who dwelt not only in greater Towns, but also in the very Countrey Villages which were near to *Antioch*, and near to one another, and that even where the far greater part of the Inhabitants were not of their Flocks, yea were not at all Christians, could be by any in their Wit judged to be any thing else save Parish Bishops or Pastors. But let us hear one of the learn'dest of our Adversaries determining the Controversie. (d) "That (saith he) which next occurs "to be considered is, in what places Bishopricks were founded, and "Bishops settled. We find in all Cities where the Gospel was planted, "and Churches constituted, that Bishops were also Ordain'd. Among "the Jews, wherever there were an hundred and twenty of them together, there did they erect a Synagogue, and a lesser *Sanhedrim* the "Court of twenty three Judges. Compare to this *Acts* 1. 15. where "the number of those that constituted the first Christian Church, is the "same. So it is like wherever there was a competent number of Christians together, that a Church was there settled. Yet in some Villages there were Churches and Bishops; so there was a Bishop in *Be-thany*: and St. Paul tells of the Church of *Cenchrea*, which was the "Port of *Corinth*. It is true, some think that the Church of *Corinth* "mett there. Which Opinion he irrefragably Refutes, and then proceeds, saying, "Therefore it's probable that the Church of *Cenchrea* "was distinct from *Corinth*: and since they had *Phebe* for their Deacons, it's not to be doubted but they had Both Bishops and Dea-

(a) Lib. 3. (b) *Eusebius* Lib. 7. Cap. 30. *Ὁ δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐκείθεν τοὺς αὐτὸν ἐπισκόπους καὶ ἱερεῖς ἀγνοοῦν τε τὴν πόλιν, καὶ τοὺς βυτρίους*——— *αὐτὸν δὲ* *εἶπε*. (c) pag. 77. (d) Dr. Burnet's Observations on the first and second Canons commonly ascribed to the Apostles, pag. 47, 48, & 49.

" cons. From the several Cities the Gospel was dilated and propagat-  
 " ed to the places round about. But in some Countries we find the Bi-  
 " shopricks very thick sett. They were pretty throng in *Africa*, for at  
 " a Conference which *Augustine* and the Bishops of that Province had  
 " with the *Donatists*, there were of Bishops two hundred eighty six pre-  
 " sent, and one hundred and twenty absent, and sixty *Sees* were then  
 " Vacant, which make in all four hundred sixty and six : there were al-  
 " so two hundred and seventy nine of the *Donatists* Bishops.

Thus he. And now, to multiply Testimonies in so confessed and plain a Matter, it's most certain that, at least, for upwards of the three first Centuries, you shall not meet with the meanest *Dorp*, or countrey place where there was a Church or Congregation to hear the Word, and receive the Sacraments, but it had also its proper Bishop, I averr no Example to the contrary either has yet, no not by Dr. *Maurice* or any other, been, or can be brought from the genuine Monuments of these times. Yea even from the spurious Writings of Impostures the greatest Adorers of the Hierarchy, good proofs of this Truth may be adduced; For the thirty eight of the Canons ascribed to the Apostles, gives the care of the Ecclesiastick Goods to the Bishop, as *Iustine Martyr* gives to his *πρεσβυς* who, as we have seen already, was purely a Parish Pastor. And the 39 ( e ) Canon saith, *Let the Presbyters and Deacons attempt nothing without the Bishop, for to him the Lord's People is committed, and for their Souls he must give an Account.* Now I demand of all Men brooking either Conscience or Candor if Souls could be committed to any save him, who was their ordinary Feeder and Instructor. And the *Pseudo-Dionysius* clearly intimats, that wherever either Baptism or the Lord's Supper was administrat'd, a Bishop was there, and was the Dispenfer thereof. The High-Priest ( saith he ( f ) ) *that is the Bishop, preaches to all Men the true Gospel, every one that desires to Partake of these Heavenly Things, coming to one of the learned in these Mysteries, desires to be led to the High-Priest----- and he brings him to the High-Priest, who receiving him with gladness as a Sheep on his shoulders----- praises the bountifull principle, by which all are called who are called at all----- The High-Priest dips him thrice. The High-Priest ( g ) himself having made a holy Prayer*

( e ) αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ πιστευόμενος τὸν λαὸν τῆς κυρίας, καὶ τὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν  
 λυγῶν αὐτοῦ λόγον ἀποκηρύσσων. ( f ) De Hierarchia Eccles. Cap. 2. Οὐδὲ  
 ἱεραρχὸς ἐκείσσι ἀποκηρύσσει πᾶσι τὰ ὄντως εὐαγγέλια. τρεῖς μὲν  
 αὐτὸν ὁ ἱεραρχὸς βαπτίζει ὅτι. ( g ) Cap. 3. Οὐδὲ ἱεραρχὸς εὐχὴν ἱερὰν ἐπὶ τῷ  
 θεῷ θυσιαστηρίου τελέσας ὅτι.

at the Divine Altar and beginning to Offer, goes round about the whole Chöre ----- and the High-Priest praising the Holy Divine Actions, sacrifices the most Divine Thing ----- and taking and delivering the Divine Communion he ends with a Holy Thanksgiving. Do (h) nothing (saith the Pseudo-Ignatius to Hero a Deacon of Antioch) without the Bishops for they are Priests, thou their Deacon: they Baptize, Sacrifice or Dispense the Lord's Supper, impose Hands: thou serves them as St. Stephen in Jerusalem administered to James and the Elders. From which place it's most evident, that all Pastors or Priests (as the Author speaks) are true Bishops, that on the account of such things as are common to all Pastors, they receive the prime Episcopal Honour and Deference, that there was a Colledge of true Bishops in the single City of Antioch, & accordingly that the rest of the Elders with James at Jerusalem were really true Bishops no less than he. I don't say that Bishops and Congregations were reciprocal everywhere in the fourth or fifth Century when these Impostors wrote, only being to personat Apostolick Men, they saw themselves obliged to mix into their Legends some shreds of true Antiquity. The stuff they invented themselves was of a far different and contrary Mettal, and far from being so conform and like to the Apostolick and prime Primitive Church.

§. 14 And here it's to be added, that as every Bishop had once, which continued in very many places for a good space, one Congregation only, so all Bishops whatsoever are of the same Dignity, and Equal with one another. For Cyprian (i) calls all Bishops Collegues, adding, we force none, we give Laws to none, seeing every Governour in the Administration of the Church, hath Power to do according to his own will, for which he is to give God an Account. And, (k) for none of us is a Bishop of Bishops, or by a Tyrannical Power can force his Collegues to Obedience &c. And Hierome (l) saith, wheresoever Bishops be, at Rome or Eugubium, Constantinople, Rhegium, Alexandria or Tanis, they are all of the same Dignity and Priest-hood, Riches and Poverty make not a Bishop either higher or lower, they are all the Successors of the Apostles. Which is also Augustine's Mind, and must be granted by all who acknowledge the Equality of the Apostles, and that Bishops were their Successors.

(h) Μὴδὲν ἀνεῖν ἢ ἐκ τῶν ἐπισκόπων ποιεῖν, ἰερεῖς γὰρ εἰσιν, οὐ δὲ διάκονος τὸν ἱερέων ὄντα. (i) (Mibi) Lib. 2. Epist. 1. (k) In sententiis Episcoporum de Hæreticis baptizandis. Page 334. (l) Epist. 85.

Now

Now the Truth of these two Things, viz. the allowableness of a Bishop to every Congregation, yea the primitive Reciprocalness of a Bishop and a Congregation, and the Equality of Bishops among themselves being supposed, which indeed is undoubtable to all the Ingenuous, their whole Hierarchy turns to nothing.

And now I hope that which some pretend to be a mighty Prejudice, viz. that Episcopacy still *de facto* has been, and from the earliest times of Christianity we hear of Bishops, is many ways removed, and that by this time it has clearly appeared, that either profound Ignorance, Ostentancy, or the massy beam of Interest in Mens Eyes has been the true Source of this Prejudice.

Moreover, suppose that it could not be easily told when this Corruption, which is like the Tares sown during the sleeping of the Husband-man, crept into the Church: Can they tell when all other Corruptions made their first Entry? As for Example, can they give a distinct account when the use of Oyl in Baptism, whereof *Tertullian* (m) speaks as of a thing constantly practis'd among Christians, came first in Fashion? The like I may say of Exorcization, and many other things altogether uncertain as to their Beginning, and yet by all Lovers of the Truth of Christianity to be Corruptions, whereof see store in *Chamier's Panstratia* (n).

Secondly, I trust also that by the foregoing Discourses, the Weapon the Papists and other Hierarchy use against the Reformed Churches to prove that they have no Ministers, because of the want of a Succession of Bishops, is sufficiently blunted.

And this minds me of an Objection I was assaulted with from a Gentleman of that Perswasion, 'twas that these Episcopal Men who ordained our Pastors, gave them the Power of Ordination neither in express Terms, nor yet intentionally; *Ergo* not at all. I Repon'd, that tho' they did not give it them *intentione Operantis*, yet notwithstanding *intentione Operis*: in so much as they ordain'd the Ministers of the Gospel, all whom we sustain to be true Bishops. I add, this is to a hair like *Becan* (o) the Jesuites arguing against *Luther's* Call to be a Protestant Minister,

(m) De Baptismo. Cap. 7. Exinde egressi de lavacro perungimur benedicta unctio de pristina Disciplina, qua unguis oleo decorum in sacerdotium solebant. (n) Tom. 4. Lib. 5. Cap. 16. (o) Compen. Manualis Cap. 12. Paragr. 11.

Ff

*Luther*



*Luther* (saith he) had no lawfull Calling to the Ministry he exercised after his Defection, for then he began to oppugn the Catholick Church, abolish Feasts, Monastick Vows, and Prayers for the Dead, these things he could not do by the Power which he had received in the Catholick Church, for the Bishop who ordained him, gave him no Power for the Destruction of the Church.

§. 15. But there yet remains a great Prejudice, and no wonder, for it comes from a great City, *Rome* (say they) and other such vast Cities, which certainly contain'd many Congregations, have been always ruled by their particular Bishops as the Catalogues yet extant evince: But tho' 'twere so, seeing it's at least, no less certain, that in other places Bishops and Congregations were Reciprocal, we are even with them, and their Argument quite evanishes, and Antiquity allows us to give a Bishop to every Congregation, no less than it warrands their giving a multitude of Parishes to any one Bishop. And Dr. *Maurice* (p) acknowledges, he never yet heard of any Man who made it essential to a Bishop to have many Congregations under him. And he's so far in the right herein that, during prime Antiquity, 'twas never so much as dream'd, that 'twas either essential or any way requisite for a Bishop to have a plurality of Congregations. It's not (saith he (q)) the being Pastor of one or many Congregations that makes one a Bishop; but the Order. There are (saith *Saravia* (r)) and have been Bishopricks so small that their Bishops had only one or two Presbyters; for we measure not a Bishoprick by the number of the Clergy or by the amplitude of the City or Diocesi, the magnitude of Riches, but by the Authority of the Episcopal Degree, altho' the Bishoprick be included in one small Parish alone. And some of the most Episcopal amongst them acknowledge that any of our Ministers tho' they have but one Parish, want nothing to make them Bishops but only the Episcopal Consecration; whereby they at once yeeld the whole Plea, destroy their Hierarchie, and withall discover their preterscriptural, and therefore antiscrptural Superstition.

And now seeing there is all the warrant and allowance that either can be desir'd or thought on that a Bishop and a Pastor of one single Flock or Congregation is one and the same, and that every Congregation may have its own proper Bishop, their Plea for the Distinction between Bishop and preaching Presbyter, tho' its Ground were no less solide than it's naught and slippery, becomes really of no subserviency at all to their

(p) page 449. (q) page 451. (r) Exam. Traet. de triplici Episcopatum Genere pag. 16,

Hierarchick

Hierarchick Cause, and so on this account is truly exhausted (for providing the Pastor of any Parish or Congregation be constantly employed in Preaching and Edifying the People, we shall not envy him others, so far as is requisite, to assist him, the People may be instructed the better) Don't therefore Dr. *Maurice* (f) and the Men of that stamp, while they pretend that tho' there be allowed to every Congregation its proper Bishop, yet there's a most different and momentous Controversie behind, about the Distinction between Bishop and Presbyter, seek, as the Proverb is, a Knot in the Rush, and trifle with a witness?

Give them moreover out of sole kindness, that the (t) Apostolick Power and Office is permanent and to be transmitted to all Bishops, yet on Supposition of these Truths, viz. that every Congregation had, yea or may have its proper Bishop, and that all Bishops are equal, they shall be compelled to desert the whole of their Plea, and acknowledge the true Foundation and Lawfulness of what they call Presbyterian Purity.

Secondly, *Eusebius* (u) plainly says that it cannot be known who were the Successors of the Apostles to feed the Churches they had planted, save what is to be collected from the words of the Apostles, and so break the Chain at the Top, where it should be strongest, and shews that their best twisted Cords become Ropes of Sand, to which, as we already noticed, the learn'dest of their own Writers subscribe.

Thirdly, To come to *Rome* in particular, altho' 'twas the Head of the World, and indeed the Head and Fountain from whence all the Hierarchicks draw their best support, no Man of Reason, whoever look'd into the divers, yea and contrary Accounts given by the Ancients of the first pretended Successors of *Peter*; can ever infer that the Romans had, in these early times of Christianity, one peculiar Diocesan Bishop over the rest of the Pastors: yea indeed *Cletus*, *Clemens*, *Lion*, all whom, if you compare the best Accounts they have, you shall find to have been at one and the same time Bishops of *Rome*, and Successors of *Peter*, are a good evidence that he had no singular Successor at all. This was so made out by the Protestant Writers, that for ought I

(f) Preface to his Defence of Diocesan Episcopacy. (t) See Doctor *Scott's* Christian Life. Vol. 2. Chap. 7. and D. M. Page 98. Et seq. (u) Hist. Eccles. Lib. 3. Cap. 8. Οσοι δὲ πάντες, καὶ τίνες ἡνέροι γαρονότες, τὰς πρὸς αὐτὸν ἱερεῖς ἱκανοὶ ποιμαίνειν ἐδωκεν ἀποστολὴν οὐκ ἀλλήλους, ὁ παλῖον εἶπεν ὅτι.

know the Romanists were despairing of any plausible Answer, altho' I doubt not, but they take Heart, since some among the Protestants (x) have used prodigious Endeavours to gratifie them, and reconcile real Contradictions, and fix the singular Successors of *Peter*. I can scarce light on any of the Books they cite, and yet I'm at no great loss. For,

4/7, It's certain that *Peter* was never at *Rome*, which at once dispatches the grand Plea of all the Hierarchicks. The whole stream of Writers (y) who record *Peter's* Voyage thither either relate or suppose that his Errand was to oppose *Simon Magnus*, so that the Truth of both these Relations must stand or fall together. But *Simon Magnus*, (if we believe *Origenes* (z)) was never there. *Simon* (saith he) the *Smarnan* and *Majician* endeavour'd by Sorcery to destroy some, and I believe deceived many with his delusions. But now throw all the World you shall scarce find thirty who follow him, and I perhaps have called them more than they are. Indeed there are some few in *Palestine*, but in the rest of the Regions of the World his very Name is not heard off, altho' he mainly desired that his Fame might be spread abroad, and if perhaps there be any report of him at all, it's only to be learned from the Acts of the Apostles. And Time, which often has discovered things commonly taken for Truth to be altogether False, hath verifi'd the words of *Origenes*: For the Statue which gave the occasion of the fiction is now found to be the Image an old Sabin King or fictitious Deity called by the Romans *Semo Sangus*, *Sangus* or *Sanctus* (a) which *Justine Martyr*, throw his unskilfulness of the Latine Tongue, and a Cheat put upon him by some *Samaritans*, took for *Simon Magnus* as is acknowledged even by the learned Romanist (b) *Valesius*. The Inscription of this statue is *Semoni Sango Deo Fido*. Now according to the Genius of the Age the fraud prevail'd, and *Simon Magnus* must be brought to *Rome*, made to effect unonstruous Prodigies; and therefore *Simon Peter* his old Adversary must also be sent thither to Conjure and Baffle him a second time. And this is the prime Source of *Peter's* imaginary Journey to *Rome*, and his fictitious Roman Episcopacy, and the whole Papal Structure. For, as *Simon Magnus* his coming to

(x) Pearson suis posthumis & Dodwell. (y) Arnobius. Lib. 2. Eusebius. Hist. Eccles. Lib. 2. Cap. 14. Epiphanius. Tom. 2. Page 59. Philastrius. Hieronymus Cat. Script. Augustinus Tom. 6. Page 6. Sulpicius severus Lib. 2. and others. (z) Contra Celsum Lib. 1. (a) Dionys. Halicar. Lib. 4. Ovidius Fast. Lib. 6. Livius Dec. 1. Lib. 8. Augustinus de civitate Dei. Lib. 13. Cap. 19. (b) Annot. in Euseb. Lib. 2. Cap. 13.

Rome is mention'd by none before *Justin*, and by him only on this false Ground, so *Peter's* Journey thither is before that time mention'd by none, save *Papias*, if he may be said to mention it, for if at all, he does it very obscurely. ( *b* ). And tho' he had been never so positive in this Matter, it's of small Consequence, for, as *Eusebius* already told us, ( tho' elsewhere ( *c* ) he forgets himself ) he was of so little Wit, so fabulous and given to believe every thing he heard, that his Testimony merites little or no Credit. *Irenaeus* indeed says that *Papias* was a hearer of the Apostles, and himself also intimats so much, but again clearly denies it while he says ( *d* ) that he used, when he met with any who had been acquainted with the Elders, to enquire what Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John, Matthew and the rest of Christ's Disciples had been wont to say. And this he intimats had been his Practice only, when he was a young Man, and so gives us clearly to understand that when he wrote, there was not one of the Hearers of the Apostles alive. So far was *Papias* from being their Disciple. 'Twas he also who gives out that *Mark* wrote not his Gospel by Divine Inspiration, but only by the help of his Memory. 'Twas he also who was the Father of the carnal and gross Chiliaists, and the first who abused the Scriptures, turning them all to Allegories, and had not so much as the knowledge to distinguish *Philip* the Apostle from *Philip* the Evangelist. The same *Papias* is the first Author of the report of *Peter's* Journey to Rome ( providing it may be said that he reportes it at all ) which mistake, as *Eusebius* intimates ( *e* ), flow'd from his misunderstanding of 1 Pet. 5. 13. The Church that is at Babylon &c. And seeing that by *Babylon* in the Apocalyps Room is mean'd, he and many of these times, thro' their want of skill to distinguish between the Prophetick Mystick, and Epistolick plain Phrase and Stile, concluded that in *Peter* also Room is to be understood. But this Gloss is so forraign and absurd that even the most learn'd of the Romanists, as *Petrus de Marca* Bishop of Paris ( *f* ) acknowledg- es that these words of *Peter* are not to be understood of Rome, but of the eastern Babylon, where ( saith the Bishop ) *Peter* was feign'd hereditary Patriark. Some indeed understand them of a City bearing that name in Egypt, and this *Spanhemius* F. and Dr. *Pearson* ( *g* ) prefer to the Assyrian Babylon :

( *b* ) *Eusebius* lib. 2. cap. 15. ( *c* ) lib. 3. cap. 36. ( *d* ) *Euseb.* lib. 3. cap. 39. ἐν τῷ που καὶ παρκολληθῆναι ἰς τοὺς πρεσβυτέρους ἑλθόν, τοὺς τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἀνεκχεῖν λίγους τὴν ἀρετῆς, ἢ τὴν Πέτρου &c. ( *e* ) *Hist. Ecclesi.* lib. 2. cap. 15. ( *f* ) de Concordia Sacerd. & Imp. tom. 2. pag. 174. ( *g* ) *Posthum.* de Succes. Rom. Pontif. Dissert. 1. cap. 8.

the former because the old Chaldean Babylon was then desolate, the latter for this that after Anlaus a chief man among the Jews in these parts had injured the Inhabitants, many of them were cut off and the rest driven from Babylon, who fled to Ctesiphon, the most part whereof notwithstanding in a combination made against them by the Assyrians and Greeks were either cut off or expell'd. Therefore he concludes that tho' Peter was the Apostle of the Circumcision, yet he could expect no harvest of the Jews in these parts. Now, as to the ground Spanhemius goes on, it seems sufficient to prove that it could not be the old Chaldean Babylon: For it's certain from Scripture, and Plinius witnesses (i) that 'twas then reduced to a solitude. It seems therefore to be meant of the Principal City of the Parthian Empire which succeeded to Babylon in name no less then in honour as is clear from that in Lucan (k),

*Cumque superba foret Babylon spolianda Trophæis*

*Ausonius.*-----

If this their chief City was Ctesiphon or Seleucia, may be a doubt Plinius (l) calls Ctesiphon the Head of the Parthian Kingdom. But Strabo seems to be more clear in this matter, and to give light to Pliny, Tacitus, Herodianus, Am. Marcellinus, or otherwise to lay open the ground of their mistake. Seleucia (saith he) (m) a City by the bank of Tigris, as Babylon was of old, is now the Metropolis of Assyria, near it there is a great Village Ctesiphon wherein the Parthian Kings used to winter, sparing Seleucia that it might not be spoiled by the warlike Scythians (by whom I understand their Auxiliary or guard Souldiers who were rude and ready to Mutiny, and therefore were not brought within their Chief and Treasure City) this Village is now arriv'd at even the power and greatness of a City. Where, as is evident, he so much prefers Seleucia to Ctesiphon that he makes the former the chief City of the Empire. Moreover Crassus when he design'd the conquest of Parthia and the possession of the Kings treasures being asked by the Messengers of Orodes King of Parthia why he broke the peace made with Pompey and Sylla, said he would answer them at Seleucia (n) proudly insinuating that he would subdue and

(i) lib. 6. cap. 26. *Cætero in solitudinem rediit, exhausta vicinitate Seleucæ.* (k) lib. 1. (l) *ibid. Ctesiphonem*-----  
*condidere Parthi quod nunc est caput Regni.* (m) lib. 16. *πυλας μὲν ἐν ἡ βαβυλῶν  
 ἐν ἀντιρότοις τῆς ἀσσυρίας, νῦν δὲ σελεύκεια ἡ ὄχι τῷ τίγρει λεγούσῃ πηλοῖον δι' ἐστὶ  
 κάμιν, κτισθὲν ἀποικίῳ αὐγῶν &c.* (n) Florus lib. 3. cap. 11. ----- Seleucia  
*se responsurum esse respondit.*

spoil their chief City. And this City expressly gets the name *Babylon* by *Stephanus* (o), and he confounds it with the old *Babylon*. Hence it appears that *Seleucia* was the chief City of the *Parthian* Empire, and commonly then got the name of *Babylon*, and that the very place of old *Chaldean Babylon* was not then known, for they were certainly in distant places; therefore, if *Josephus* seem to mention another *Babylon* distant from the chief City of the *Parthians* this is rather to be understood of the Country *Babylonia* than of the old *Chaldean Babylon* which then was ruined now tho' the *Jews* for a time might be compelled to leave that principal City of *Parthia* they might notwithstanding soon after be permitted to return no less than these who were expelled *Rome* by *Claudius*, got Liberty shortly to come thither again. This *Dr. Pearson* allows and therefore cannot deny the probability of the other. However this be, nothing is more certain than that by *Babylon*, which *Peter* mentions, the literal proper and well known *Babylon*, which was then the chief City of *Parthia Seleucia*, must be meant, otherways the dispersion to which he writes had neither known where he was nor what Church saluted them, which is quite contrary to the Apostles Intention there. For at that time the *Apocalypse* was not written, and yet on this most false Supposition viz. that by *Babylon* *Peter* understands *Rome*, was his Journey thither founded and so must prove no less false in the matter of fact, and with it his Episcopacy and that of the earliest Popes his pretended Successors seeing all lean on his Journey thither. And 'tis with no less confidence and concord averred and delivered then is either his, or his pretended Successors their Episcopacy, or ought else Subsequent to this his falsly supposed Voyage. And indeed the evidence of this our Assertion is so strong that it compell'd even the learned Romanists themselves to acknowledge the Truth thereof, as *J. Bapt. Mansuetus*, *Michael Casen*, *Marsilius Patavinus*, *Joh. Aventinus*, *Joh. Lelandus*, *Car. Molinus*, who are Cited by *Spanhemus F.* in his Golden Dissertation on that Subject (p).

In the mean while I cannot but wonder how this otherways accurat and learned Antiquary (q) finds an *Aegyptian Babylon* in that distick of *Martial* (r).

(o) ad vocem *Babylon*. Βαβυλὼν περσικὴ πόλις, μητρόπολις, σελευκία καλεῖσθαι. (p) Page 22. (q) page 146. (r) Lib. 14, Epigr. 15.



*The Fundamentals of the*  
*Hac ubi Memphis Tellus dat munera, vestra est*  
*Pectine Nilaco jam Babylonis acu.*

Th' Egyptian flay gives Tapistry more fine  
 Than ever *Babylon* could sue or spin.

Where the Poet only prefers the *Ægyptain* woven Cloath to the finest needle-work of the old *Chaldean Babylon*; But, as it is most apparent, no more here either expesses or insinuates that there is a place named *Babylon* in *Ægypt*, then (1) where he comends a Gown bestow'd on him by *Parthenius* a gentle-man of *Domitius's* Chamber in this distick,

*Non ego pratulerim Babylonica picta superbe*  
*Texta, semiramidæ que variantur acu.*

It far excells the rich Embroideries  
 Of *Babylon* built by *Semiramis*.

Moreover *Clemens Romanus* speaking of the Death of *Peter* and *Paul*, intimates that he knew sufficiently where and by whom *Paul* was kill'd with other such Circumstances of his Death, but insinuates that he had no such knowledge of any such Circumstances of the Death of *Peter*. And it's colligible from *Jerome* (1) that both *Peter* and *Paul* were not kill'd by the *Romans* but by the *Jews*, in, or not far from *Palestine*.

'Twere easie to discover the Forgerie and Falshood of their other Catalogues of Bishops pretended to have been in the like great Cities, as for example that of the Bishops of *Jerusalem* whereof they sain (u) that the Apostles made *James* Bishop, and that on a ground to base and carnal, viz. *because he was the Son of Joseph, and so related to Christ whom the Apostle Paul knew not according to the flesh.* 2 Cor. 5. 16. and then make him and his pretended successor *Simeon* to continue Bishops of that See from a little after the death of our Savior to, I know not what year of *Trajanus*, between which time and *Adrian Trajanus's* immediat successor his rebuilding of *Jerusalem*, they give to that Church thirteen Bishops, to all of whom little more than twenty years can be assign'd; yea some three or four of these are cramm'd into one year (x) and yet we hear of none of these thirteen who died a violent death, but which yet more fully discovers the Forgery all along from the destruction of

(1) Lib. 8. Ep. 28. (1) in 23. Mat. (u) Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 2. cap. 1. ὅτι δὲ καὶ ἦτορ τοῦ Ἰωάννου ἀνθίστατο πάλιν. καὶ ἡ χρεὶς πατρὸς οὗ Ἰωάννου. Euseb. hist. Eccl. lib. 3. cap. 32. & lib. 4. cap. 5. (x) Euseb. Chronic.

the City by Titus, untill 'twas rebuilt by Adrian there was no Inhabitant there, no place for my L. Bishop's grace, nothing whereon to exercise the Episcopal power save rubbish and desolation. (y) In none of the Churches (saith Dr. Stillingfleet) most spoken of is the succession so clear as is necessary. For at Jerusalem it seems somewhat strange how fifteen Bishops of the Circumcision should be crowded into so narrow a room as they are, so that many of them could not have above two years time to rule in the Church. And it would bear an inquiry where the seat of the Bishops of Jerusalem was from the time of the destruction of the City by Titus, (when the walls were laid even with the ground by Musonius) till the time of Adrian.

I shall yet in the last place adduce a few passages, and I intreat my Reader seriously to weigh them and from whom they came, for I am sure they will give great light and satisfaction to all the truly conscientious and disinterested.

The sixth Anathematism (saith a Romanist z) was much noted in Germany; in which an Article of Faith was made of HIERARCHY, which word and signification thereof is alien, not to say contrary to the holy Scriptures: and tho' 'twas somewhat antiently invented, yet the Author is not known, and in case he were, yet he is an Hyperbolicall Writer, not imitated in the use of that Word, nor of others of his Invention, by any of the Ancients: and following the Stile of Christ our Lord, and the Holy Apostles, and primitive Church, it ought to be named, not Hierarchy, but Hierodiaconia, or Hierodoulia. And Dr. Heylen, who (a) like to Balaam blessing Israel when he would fainest have cursed them, uses to establish a Presbyterian Parity of Pastors while he is most desirous to destroy it, makes the Bishop in Justine Martyr's time all one with the President of the Congregation and ordinary Preacher of God's Word and Celebrator of the Eucharist therein. And pleads that in Tertullian's mind Baptism was a work most proper to the Bishop in regard of his Episcopacy or particular Office. And the Doctor contends out of Tertullian that in his time Christians receiv'd the Eucharist only from the Bishop's hands (b), and so there were no fewer Bishops than Congregations who mett for hearing of the Word and Celebration of the Sacraments. What shew of reason can be given (saith Dr. Stillingfleet (c) why the Apostles should slight the Constitution of the Jewish Syna-

(y) Iren. pag. 301. (z) Suavis Hist. of the Council of Trent pag. 743.  
(a) Hist. of Episcopacy, part 2. page 39. (b) part 2 page 96, 97. (c) Iren. page 257.

gogues, which had no dependance on the Jewish Hierarchy, and subsisted not by any Command of the Ceremonial Law? The Work of the Synagogue not belonging to the Priests as such, but as Persons qualified for instructing others. And (d) We are to take notice, that the Rulers of the Church under the Gospel do not properly succeed the Priests and Levites under the Law, whose Office was Ceremonial, and who were not admitted by any solemn Ordination into their Function.-----It is then a common Mistake to think that the Ministers of the Gospel succeeded by way of Correspondence and Analogy to the Priests under the Law; which Mistake hath been the Foundation and Originall of many Errors. For when in the primitive Church, the name of Priests came to be attributed to Gospel-Ministers from a fair Complaisance (as was thought then) of the Christians only, to the name used both among Jews and Gentiles; in process of time, corruptions increasing in the Church, those names that were used by the Christians by way of Analogy and Accommodation, brought in the things themselves primarily intended by these names: so by the metaphorical names of Priests and Altars, at last came up the Sacrifice of the Mass; without which, they thought the names of Priests and Altars were insignificant. This Mistake we see run all along thro' the Writers of the Church, as soon as the name Priests was apply'd to the Elders of the Church, that they derived their Succession from the Priests of Aaro.'s Order. In short he still contends that the model of Governing the Christian Church was an exact imitation of that of the Synagogues, which were no other thing than the particular parish Churches among the Jews, and in every one of which there was a Bishop parallel to him who, in the Apocalypse, is the Angel of the Church.

And Dr. Lightfoot is of the same mind; "The Apostle (saith he) "(e) calleth the Minister *Erisopou*, from the common and known "title of the CHAZAN or Overseer in the Synagogue. And (f) "Besides these there was the publick Minister of the Synagogue who "pray'd publicly and took care about reading the Law, and sometimes preached if there were not some other to discharge this Office. "This person was called SHELIACH TSIBBOR the Angel of the "Church, and CHAZAN HAKENESETH the Chazan or Bishop of "the Congregation. The *Aruch* gives the reason of the name: The Chazan "(saith he) is SHELIACH TSIBBOR the Angel of the Church (or

(d) pag. 254, 255. (e) Vol. I. pag. 308. (f) Vol. 2. pag. 133.

"the

"the publick Minister) and the *Targum* renders the word ROVEH by  
 "the word HOSE one that oversees. *For it's incumbent on him to oversee*  
 "*how the Reader reads and whom he may call out to read in the Law.* The  
 "publick Minister of the Synagogue himself read not the Law publick-  
 "ly but every Sabbath he called out seven of the synagogue (on other  
 "days fewer) whom he judged fit to read. He stood by him that  
 "read, with great care observing that he read nothing either falsly, or  
 "improperly and calling him back and correcting him, if he had failed  
 "in any thing, and hence he was called CHAZAN that is Επισκόπος i. e.  
 "Bishop or Overseer. Certainly the signification of the word *Bishop*  
 "and *Angel of the Church* had been determin'd with less noise if re-  
 "course had been made to the proper fountains and men had not vainly  
 "disputed about the signification of words taken I know not whence. The  
 "service and worship of the Temple being abolished as being Ceremo-  
 "nial, God transplanted the worship and publick adoration of God  
 "used in the synagogues, which was moral, into the Christian Church:  
 "to wit, the publick Ministry, publick prayers, reading God's Word,  
 "and preaching &c. Hence the names of the Ministers of the Gospel  
 "were the very same, the Angel of the Church, the Bishop which be-  
 "longed to the Ministers in the synagogues. There were also three  
 "Deacons or Almoners on whom was the care of the poor &c. Among  
 "the Jews (saith Dr. *Burnet* (g) he who was the chief of the syna-  
 "gogue was called CHAZAN HAKENESETH the Bishop of the Con-  
 "gregation and SHELIACH TSIBBOR the Angel of the Church. And  
 "the Christian Church being modelled as near the form of the syna-  
 "gogue as they could be, as they retained many of the Rites so the form  
 "of the government was continued, and the names remained the same.  
 "And (b) In the synagogues there was first one, that was called the Bishop  
 "of the Congregation. Next, the three Orderers, and Judges of every  
 "thing about the synagogue who were called TSEKENIM, and by the  
 "Greeks πρεσβύτεροι or γέροντες that is Elders. These ordered and deter-  
 "mined every thing that concern'd the synagogues or the persons in it.  
 "Next them, were the three PARNASSIN or Deacons, whose charge  
 "was to gather the Collections of the rich, and to distribute them to the  
 "poor.

(g) Observ. on the 1 Can. page 2. (b) Obs. on the 2 Can. page 82.

"All the Presbyters (saith the Learned *Le Moyne* (i)) took not on them the barden of preaching and expounding the scriptures, some were taken up in serving at the administration of the Sacraments searching into scandals, visiting the sick, strengthening the weak, and providing for the Churches profit, but the business of preaching belonged only to the Apostles the Bishops and the first Presbyters. Hence in times of the ancient Church the Bishops perpetually preached which the inferior Presbyters did not except they were admitted thereto by the Bishops and chief Presbyters.

Most memorable to this purpose are the words of the learned Jesuite *Sirmondus* (k) "Anciently (saith he) the Bishops only and no others preached the word of God for this was their proper province and work 'twas afterwards, tho' not alike soon every where, allowed to the Presbyters to preach: this was soonest begun in the East, as is clear from the practice of *Pierius*, *Chrysostome*, and others who preached while they were only Presbyters.

And now judge, tho' nothing else had been adduced but what is just now brought from these profoundly learn'd and most unsuspected Arbiters, if the Regimen and Way of the true primitive Church was not according to the Gospell Humility and Simplicity, most opposite to a terrene Domination, Prelaticall Grandor and Power over other Pastors, and the vanity of preterscripturall and superstitious Ceremonies? if she then enjoy'd not Bishops or Pastors, Ruling Elders and Deacons? if then, whosoever had power to dispense the Word and Sacraments with the Charge of any particular Flock or Congregation, was not reciprocally one and the same with a Bishop, and finally, if the primitive Way was not entirely one with that of our Church of Scotland, and others of the reformed Churches, which is now known by the name of *Presbytry*?

Hence it's carefully to be noted how odd and grievous Alterations were made both as to the use of Terms and in the Offices they had primitively signifid in Scripture. In, yea even after the Apostolick Age we find that the word *Bishop*, whereever it holds forth an ordinary Church-Officer, alwayes signifying a Labourer in the Word and Doctrine, and Dispenser of the Sacraments, Pastor of a Flock or Congrega-

(i) *Varia Sacra* torn. 2. pag. 35. *Nam non omnes Presbyteri unus concionandi et Verbum Dei enarrandi in se recipiebant &c.* (k) *apud Le Moyne* pag. 26, *ibid.* *Verbum Dei, sibi olim in Ecclesia practicabant Episcopi, quorum proprie id Munus erat. Post etiam id Presbyteris sed non uno apud omnes tempore permiffum &c.*

Sect. 10. *examin'd and disprov'd.* 229  
 tion. We find also the Word *Presbyter* taken as its equivalent denoting  
 this very thing: elsewhere (as is now made evident) the word *Presby-*  
*ter* signifies no Pastor of a Flock, but only one who was to assist him in  
 Ruling and Guidance thereof; some also of this latter kind of Presby-  
 ters designing the Ministry, there beeing then few or no Theological  
 Schools, were trained up for the Office under the Inspection of Bishops  
 or Parochial Pastors, and accordingly whiles assisted them therein.  
 But this was only accidental to the Office of a ruling *Presbyter*.  
 Afterward there was a new kind of Church Office invented whose chief  
 work was not to feed any Flock or Congregation and yet was reputed  
 the Pastor of many Flocks which was a compleat Contradiction. His  
 Province was mainly to rule and domineer over a multitude of both Past-  
 ors and Flocks, him they called the Bishop. Another Office equally  
 new and unknown to Scripture and prime Antiquity was a kind of semi-  
 pastor or half Minister who was to do all the Ministeriall Work, and  
 yet was so far from having any Pastorall Power that on the contrary he  
 was only the subject and substitute of another, and him they called the  
*Presbyter*: As for the other sort of Presbyters they came in time to be  
 well nigh intirely abolished and forgotten. The like *(Chrysostome (1))*  
*observes of the Deacons, saying that in his time such Deacons as the*  
*Apostles ordained were not in the Church.* Hence it's not strange if the  
 Ancients, while sometimes they violent the Scriptures to make them  
 favour what in their own times was obtaining, and at other times while,  
 either out of design and freedome, or casually they light on the true  
 Meaning of the Scriptures, speak most perplexedly of Bishops and  
 Presbyters, and afford no small ground of Wrangling and Disputation  
 to all that are exercised in this Controversy.

In the mean while such Immutation was not made in a day, 'twas  
 slow and apparently plausible like the weed which at length you may  
 see that it is grown up, yet its act of growing ye shall never perceive.  
 This Alteration, as even *Spanhemius F. (m)* no enemy to the Hie-  
 rarchy, observes, began first in great Cities, and beside the gene-  
 rall occasions or rather pretexts for it, which we already noted,  
 there was this colour more peculiar to great Cities; in *Rome*, for ex-  
 ample, tho there were Christians sufficient to make up severall ordinary

(1) On the 6 of the *Acts* hom. 14. (m) *Introduct. ad Hist. Nov.*  
*Test. Pag. 166.*



Congregations, yet at some special times all or most of these used to meet at one place, and accordingly were accounted but one Church. This might occasion the making of a *προεδρος* or one particular Moderator among the Pastors who got some primacy of Order, and at these more solemn meetings of the People appeared & spake most and in time got the appropriation of the name *Bishop*: all this was notwithstanding only a meer proflasy: he must next have a power over his Collegues in the City: the Bishops, the parochial Pastors of the Country and lesser Cities are next to be invaded.

This Fermentation, which had small beginnings and still grew untill all was soured, fuelled especially and was most operative in a time of peace, whereof in the third Century they had a good space, even from the Death of *Valerian* untill *Dioclesian's* Persecution. The Emperors themselves (saith *Eusebius* (m)) then so much favoured them that they not only gave them Liberty of the publick Exercise of their Religion, but also made some of them their Chamberlains and Governours of Provinces. In this time the alteration of both Government and Worship was certainly not a litle promoted. For nothing then reign'd among the Christians but contention & ambition. They were not content (continous he) with the former Edifices but builded large Churches from the foundation----- But when thro' too much liberty we fell into sloath and negligence, when every one began to envy and backbite another, when we managed as 'twere an intestine warr amongst ourselves with Words as with Swords, Pastors against Pastors, and People against People, being dashed one on another, exercised strife and tumult, when deceit and Guile had grown to the highest pitch of wickedness----- When being void of all sense we did not so much as once think how to please God; yea rather on the other hand impiously we imagined that human Affairs are not at all guided by Divine Providence, we daily added Crimes to Crimes when our Pastors having despised the Rule of Religion strove mutually with one another, studying nothing more then how to outdoe one another in strife, threatening Emulation, Hatred, and mutual Enmity, proudly usurping Principalities or Prelacies as so many places of Tyrannicall Domination.

To this time doubtless did the *Nicene* Fathers look in their *αρχαία* *αἰών* Ancient Customs that they mention, which will be denied by none who remember that even things of a very late date (n) used then to be

(m) Hist. Eccles. Lib. 8. Cap. 1. — *ἐπαυξήσαντες οἱ αὐτοὶ τετραπλῆς τὰς οἰκουμένης ἐκθύσαντες ἐκδικήσαντες.* (n) Vide sis *Clementis* Epist. Pag. 112. & Item i verba ap. d *Eusebium* hist. Eccles. Lib. 5. Cap. 24. & *Opusculum* *Milevitanum* Lib. 1. called

called ancient, and, which is yet more, they were wont to pretend Apostolick Authority and Tradition for every one of their Innovations. For this their Pride and Superstition and such Vices God sent a long and most grievous Persecution, after which it might have been reasonably thought they would have returned to the Humility and Simplicity of the Gospell, and Apostolick Age. But so far were they from this that the Gangren began faster than ever to consume the Vitals of Christianity, and having got a Christian Emperor to indulge and enrich them they quickened their Pace, and in the gadiness of Pride and giddiness of Superstition, extravagating without bounds in this Declension they piece and piece laid aside the Scripture, and in the model of their Government and Worship eyed and followed three patterns, the Jewish Policy, Ceremonies, and Temple, where there was one High-Priest, the magnificent and splendid Government of the Roman Empire, over which there was one Head, one Emperor. And lastly, the way of the Roman Pagan Priests in which there was also at *Rome* a *Pontifex Maximus* or High-Priest over all the many Degrees of Priests in the Empire, and so in process of time it came to pass that he who by his first Institution was design'd to be a Pastor of a Flock or Congregation, and to imitate the Apostolick Simplicity and Humility, turned to be the great Antichrist, the son of Perdition, and grand Emissary and Lieutenant of the red Dragon, and these who were ordain'd to be his Fellow-Pastors and Ministers of the Gospel became his Underlings and Slaves in that Apostacy, and being martial'd into a thousand Ranks and Orders proved so many Squadrons of hellish Locusts, so that scarce in any part of the Creation of God was there ever a more sad and direfull Depravation, if it were not when our first Parents fell into the Cloutches of the old Serpent, or when the Sons of God became his greatest Enemies, and those morning Stars, the beautifull Angels turned into infernal Firebrands, black and abominable Devils.

Most observable notwithstanding, yea and adorable is Divine Providence in this, that even in the growth and increase of this black Apostacy, the Church in Opinion and Doctrine, at least, still held fast the great, and capital Articles of Christianity, as the sufficiency of the Canonick Books of Scripture, the Doctrine of the holy Trinity, of free Grace, of Justification by Faith in Christ's Blood &c. Their great sin lay not in the Defect but in the Excess, by superadding to these golden

en

232      *The Fundamentals of the Hierarchy*      Part II.  
 en Foundations a heap of hay and stubble, the wild Fancies of Apostatizing  
 Brains; And in process of time equalizing, yea and preferring them to  
 these Divine and most necessary Truths comprehended in the Books of  
 the Old and New Testament. Then it was when, tho' they still ac-  
 knowledged the Identity of Bishop and preaching Presbyter, or Pastor  
 of a Congregation, they must, among't the rest of their novell Pop-  
 peries, raise one Bishop, or High-Priest ( as they spoke ) over a num-  
 ber of other Pastors, and Churches, whose Ordination and Consecration  
 must be accompani'd with a dale of Alloy suitable to this their humane  
 and unwarrantable Institution: He must have a Cudgell put in his hand,  
 to signifie his Rule and Authority over the People, and a Ring to signifie  
 his Pontifical Honour, and the hidden Mysteries wherewithall he is  
 intrusted ( *m* ) The Bishop being consecrated, shaven, and anointed,  
 it was his proper Work and Office to erect and consecrate Churches, to  
 make their Chrism or Holy Oyl; For the Art of Besmearing was  
 pretty early in the Church, no later at least than their Diocesan, and  
 therewith to anoint the forehead, Eyes, and Ears of the Baptized, to  
 receive the Penitents, and perform such greasy businesses about them.  
 These and the like Actions were reserved as the special Ornament and  
 Badges of the High-Priest's Honour ( *n* ). And indeed hitherto they  
 acted congruously, for 'twas but meet, that their own Antichristian  
 Inventions, the Institution whereof *never came into God's mind*, should be  
 appropriated to their own Church-Officer whom God never appointed,

*Cetera conveniunt sed non levis error in uno est.*

For they debased and polluted God's Ordinance, I mean the Ordi-  
 nation of Pastors which they threw in among their Trash, and left  
 likewise to their Bishop or High-Priest as a part of his peculiar Province  
 ( Superstitionists sometimes for such Fooleries deprave the Scripture,  
 which Dr. *Li-hisfoot* one of the learn'dest of the Church-of-England  
 Divines, observes and baffle's, *Here* ( saith he ) ( *o* ) *Episcopacy*  
*thinketh it hath an undeniable Argument for Proof of its Hierarchy, and of*  
*the strange Rite of Confirmation &c.* ) And this is, very like another Prac-  
 tice for Antiquity also not a white lower than their Diocesan, they

( *m* ) *Isidorus de Officiis lib. 2. cap. 6.* ( *n* ) *Vide Con. Hispalense 2.*  
*Cin. 7. apud Carranzam fol. 269. & Isidorum de Originib. lib. 7. cap. 12. & de*  
*Officiis Ecclesiasticis lib. 2. cap. 7. & Rabanum Maurum de Institut. Cler. lib. 1.*  
*cap. 6: ( o ) on Acts 8, 17.*

made

made another fixed Church-Officer whom they called an Exorcist. His Office was to dispossess and cast out Devils (*p*). Now surely such an ordinary Church-Officer was never appointed by God, and therefore, 'tis most likely that some of those Exorcists needed some to have casten the Devils out of themselves, or at least, to have giv'n them a round doze of Hellebore, no less, then did any of the <sup>exorcists</sup> ~~exorcists~~ their Patients. But seeing they made such a Church-Officer, and the dispossessing of Devils was among'st the greatest and most miraculous Works that ever was practis'd even by the greatest Apostles. It may be thought that this Exorcist was one of their highest Church-Officers, a Metropolitan certainly, Arch-Bishop or Patriarch, but he was none of these, yea he was no Bishop, no Presbyter, no Deacon, no Sub-Deacon, yea not so much as an Acolyth, that is a *Candle-carrier*, for they us'd in fair-day-light and Sun-shine to light Candles in the Church to obey and fulfill (as they said) that Scripture, John 1. 9. *That was the true Light, which lighteneth every Man that cometh into the World* (*q*). This Exorcist was yet a degree lower than their *Candle-Carrier*, and therefore was plac'd in the very rear and tail of all their Clergy. So dangerous, yea and unaccountable were many of their Actings, but especially in the matter of Church-Office-bearing.

Moreover I appeal to all the judicious and conscientious if out of a conscientious desire of conforming to the primitive Church, our Adversaries make such a horride noise, bustle and Schism for their Hierarchy. For, suppose it to be as true as I hope by this time to all the unbiass'd it's manifested to be false, that in all points they could vouch their Hierarchy to be warranted by the true primitive Church and the Government of the one intirely like that of the other, yet do they not desert her in many other things? Did the primitive Church use Organs in Divine Worship? Were they not first introduced in the seventh Century by Pope *Vitalian* (*r*) And yet it is doubtfull if they were so soon received: For *Aquinas* dislikes and condemns them (*s*). Or where, pray, in the true primitive Church shall they find the Surplice, Corner-Cap and Tippet? Or where, to name no more,

(*p*) Vide *Isidorum de originib. Lib. 7. Cap. 12. & Rabanum Maurum de Institut. Clericorum Lib. 1. Cap. 10.* (*q*) Vide *Isidorum de originib. Lib. 7. Cap. 12. Rabanum Maurum de Institut. Lib. 1. Cap. 9.* (*r*) *Platina in Vitaliano & Volater. apud Onuphrium in Chronographia.* (*s*) *Secunda secunda Quest. 91. Articuli. 2.*

shall they find the Bishop allowed to involve himself in secular cares ; Civil and State Offices or Employments ? Some used indeed, when they pleased, the Christian Emperor allowing it, to make the Bishops Arbiters of their private Debates, but to all the good Bishops, as *Augustine* ( *t* ) complains, this was a most weighty Grievance. But in more early times even this was not permitted, for *Cyprian* ( *u* ) condemns as altogether unlawfull that any Church-man should be so much as a testamentary Tutor to any Pupil. And mark the ground he goes on, For (saith he) *whosoever are honoured with the Divine Priest-Hood or have a place in the Clergy ought only to serve at the Altar, and spend their time in Prayer and Supplication. For, 'tis written, no Man that warreth intangleth himself with the Affairs of this Life, that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a soldier.* This is such a clear and inevitable Condemnation of the Practice of the Hierarchicks, that the Learned Annotators, *Pamelius*, and the Bishop of Oxford, finding nothing wherewith to elude it, skip it over with deep silence. And now judge if *Cyprian* was of one mind with the Bishop of Five Churches, who will have the meaning of *Paul's* words cited by *Cyprian* to be ( *x* ) that every Christian ought to abstain from those things which are repugnant to Christian Profession, which are *sin* only; and will not have the Apostle to speak any thing of Church-men in particular, or if *Cyprian* would have expon'd the sixth of the Canons ascribed to the Apostles as doth *Heylyn*, who ( *y* ) makes the Canon only to mean that Bishops or inferiour Clergy-Men might not be Consuls, Prætors, Generals, or undergoe such publick Offices in the State of Rome, as were most sought for and esteemed by the Gentiles there. *Heylen* is here somewhat intricat, and his cause required it. However the sum of his drift is, that the exercising of these or the like Offices is allowed to any Pastor by the Canon. Now, altho' 'tallowed it not when the Empire was Pagan, and he would prove something of this kind from 1 Cor. 6. where he must count all Magistrats thro' the Christian World, Pagans and Unbelievers, for otherways none shall ever prove from this Scripture, so much as the lawfullness of a Bishop or Pastors, judging and determining any difference between any two that referre themselves to his Arbitration. And tho' he should prove it, pray what is this to

( *t* ) In *Psalmum* 118. ( *u* ) Lib. 1 Ep. 9. ——— Cum singuli divinosacerdotis honorati & cuncti in clericali Ministerio constituti non nisi altari & sacrificiis deservire, & precibus atque orationibus vacare debeant. Scriptum est enim &c. ( *x* ) Hist. of the Council of Trent. pag. 490. ( *y* ) Hist. of Episcop. part 2. page 25. ( *z* ) part. 2. pages 22, 23. the

the exercising the Office of Consul, General, Prætor, Chancellor, Treasurer or the like pieces of such temporal Power and Grandor? Judge moreover, were there no more but *Paul* his words to *Timothy*, 1. 4, 13, 14, 15. And 2 *Tim.* 4. 2, 5. If there be Leasure left any Pastor to be either Consul, General, or ought else of this nature; and consequently if all the shifts they use on this head be not sufficiently overthrowed by these Scriptures only. But I had almost forgotten to notice how they torment themselves that they may torment and detort *Cyprian*, For *Saravia* says, that the Canon *Cyprian* speaks off was but particular and provincial only for the Church of Carthage. But *Heylen* refutes *Saravia* his comment and says *Cyprian* spoke so, because the Church was then almost destitute and unprovided of Presbyters. As if *Cyprian* had not spoken of Church-men absolutely and without the least intimation of any such restriction, and grounded his saying on a Scripture which, whatsoever it speaks of Church-men, confessedly says it of themall, be they many or few or in whatsoever time and place they live. Moreover it's most certain that in *Matthew* 20. 25, 26, 27, 28. The Princes of the Gentiles &c. And *Mark* 10. 42, 43, 44, 45. And *Luke* 22. 25, 26, 27. All Pastors of Flocks are prohibited to exercise Dominion, secular and state Dignity, and a parity of the Apostles amongst themselves, and in them a parity of all ordinary Pastors or Ministers of the Gospell among themselves is enjoyed. D. M. (a) pretends to engage with the latter part of this Inference, but first he mis-states the question as if from these Texts we pleaded for a perfect equality of all the Officers of Christs house without distinction between extraordinary and ordinary Ministers, or between Pastors and other Officers, and so his saying that the Apostles exercised Jurisdiction over other Ecclesiasticks, whether true or false, is nothing to the purpose. But saith D. M. Our blessed Saviour supposeth degrees of Subordination amongst his own Disciples as well as other societies, and therefore he directs the Ecclesiasticks who would climb up to the highest places in the Church, to take other methods than these that are most usual amongst the Grandees of the World: He that deserved preferment in the Church was to be the servant of all. Which answer he steals from the Jesuite *Bellarmino* (b) who answers that Christ only directs ecclesiastick Princes, & teaches that as such they ought to rule their subjects, not as do Kings

(a) part. 2. pag. 376. 377. (a) Pag. 16 & seq. (b) De Pontifice Lib. 5. Cap. 20.



and Lords, but as Fathers and Pastors, To whom Junius replies (c) that all this is quite contrarie to both Christs words and scope, The sons of Zebedie (saith he) desired a Dominion, this Christ rejects and refuses to give them; again the falshood of this answer is demonstrated positively by Christs following words, who in stead of this Dominion which they desired, enjoyns them a humble Ministry and Service. Wherefore there is a clear opposition between Dominion and Ministry, the former belonging the world, the latter to the Church. Bishops are not (saith Bellarmine) here forbidden to exercise a dominion like that of godly Kings, but only like that of Tyrannical Kings who know not God. We deny (replies Junius) that there is any such restriction, neither can it be proved. And accordingly Junius refutes and baffles all the Sophistrie that Bellarmine, and, after him, our Prelatists ordinarily bring to prove that only tyranny and not all sort of principality or superiority is by our Saviour in these Texts, prohibited. And with Junius joyns the whole stream of Protestant Writers. But our Saviour (saith D. M.) did that himself among them, which he now commanded them to do to one another, and therefore the doing of this towards one another in obedience to the command now under consideration, could not infer a Parity, unless that they blasphemously infer that Christ and his Apostles were equal: For our Saviour recomends what he enjoyns from his own constant and visible practice among them, viz, that he himself who was their Lord and Master, was their servant, and therefore, it becomes the greatest among them, in imitation of him, to be modest, calm, and humble, towards all their subordinate Brethren. A sturdy argument forsooth, as if our most blessed Master to quell his Disciples their ambition of aspiring to a preheminance over one another, and to render them more content with a humble and brotherly parity, could not adduce and urge his own most holy and meek example of his most wonderful condescending to take upon him the form of a Servant, and do the works of a Servant among his Apostles, and that so humble, as if he had been only their Companion and nothing above them: but he must anone be concluded to degrade and throw down himself into a meer equality with his Disciples. Can any in the exercise of his wit make such a Collection? Neither can better befall him: for, as is his constant practice this wretched Paralogism he also borrows from another Jebusite Cornelius a Lapide, who at the same rate depraves this Text of Matthew to save from a mortal blow Peter's fictitious Primacy. But in the next place, which is little better, D. M. turns Jew on our hand: Let it be further considered (saith he) that

the Hierarchy and Subordination of Priests was established by Divine Authority in the Jewish Church, and if our Saviour had pulled down that ancient Polity, and commanded an equality among the Presbyters of the New Testament, he would not have stated the Opposition between his own Disciples and the Lords of the Gentiles, but rather between the Priests of the Mosaic Oeconomy and the Disciples of the New Testament. And again, fearing lest his Judaism and also his self-repugnancy should not have otherways been apparent enough, We do not (saith he (d)) now plead, as some ignorant People may pretend, that there ought to be a Bishop above Presbyters, because that there was a High-Priest among the Jews, but rather thus, that the Hierarchy that obtained in the Patriarchal and Jewish Oeconomy was never abrogated in the new. Well then, is there on Earth a visible High-Priest over the whole Church the Levitical Orders, Rites, & Temple-service, the very things wherein the Jewish Hierarchy consisted, and shadows of Christ to come, now allowable. But to come to his cavill, and quiet this child of Ignorance, D. M. should know that beside the Disciples ambition to get up over one another, according to the carnal apprehension they then entertained of Christs kingdom ( wherein our Hierarchick Lord Bishops are the Apostles successors indeed, and all Hierarchicks, men of Apostolick principles ) they looked also for a great, worldly, and civil power and dominion, which was not at all comprehended in the Jewish Priesthood, nor was then possessed by any of the Priests; and so our Lord's stating the opposition between his Disciples and the Lords of the Gentiles, is by far more apt for his purpose than if he had stated it between them and the Priests of the old Oeconomy, which had been altogether lame, and doon scarce the half of his business. In a word, the Romishness and Falshood of all these his Cavills is manifest, were there no more, from this only, that if they do any thing, they make for the defence of that new Romish Doctrine of Peter's Supremacy, which both the Fathers, and all sound Protestants, not only Presbyterians, but also Episcopal, yea some that otherwise deserve not the name of Protestants, as Dr. Heyten (e), explode, & prove that there was a compleat Equality & Parity amongst the Apostles: And they deduce their Conclusion especially from this text of *Matthew's Gospel* and its parallels. And indeed if there be, as doubtless there are, any places of Scripture fit to prove it,

(d) page 27. (e) Hist. of Episcopacy part 1 pag. 15. &amp; seq.

238      *The Fundamentals of the Hierarchy*      Part II.  
 these texts deservedly hold the first place. The Author of the *Opus im-*  
*perfectum*, thought by some to be *Chrysostomus*, saith, on this place of  
*Matthew*, *Quicumque autem desiderat primum in terrâ, inveniet confusio-*  
*nem in cælo*, Whosoever desires a primacy on Earth, shall find Confusion in  
 Heaven. Now suppose the truth of these words, and compare them  
 with the words of the Apostle 1 *Tim.* 3. 1. *If a man desires the Office of a*  
*Bishop, he desires a good work.* And it's clear the Office of a Bishop is  
 quite another thing than a Primacy; for to desire the former is lawfull  
 and laudable, but to desire the latter is dangerous and damnable: and  
 so much by the way, for I love not to transcribe the labours of others  
 (f). And so angry is D. M. at *New Opinions*, and for their sake at  
 every thing that's New, that he scarce ever advances any Argument, Vin-  
 dication, or Defence, but what is so frequently and soundly b<sup>e</sup>st'd, so  
 bare and worn, as to v<sup>y</sup> even with the old ancient Garments of the  
*Gibconites*. These Texts, as I said, prohibite also all Pastors of Flocks  
 to exercise Dominion, Secular or State Dignities, which is irrefragably  
 made out by our Writers against *Bellarmino de Pontifice*, and other Ro-  
 manists. However *βίος & τι γλῶσσης* either the Possession or Hope of such  
 Emoluments and Dignities, as also the glistening gayetrie of gorgious  
 and theatrick Ceremonies, close mens mouths, and keep them from ack-  
 nowledging the Truth, for which even a Pagan (g) may come in to  
 reprove them,

*O curva interris anima, & cælestium inanes!*  
*Quid juvat hoc templis nostras immittere mores?*  
*Et bona Dijs ex hac scelerata ducere pulpa.*

Dull earthy minds who know no heavenly thing,  
 What profits it into the Church to bring  
 Our own Inventions? or to dream that we  
 Can with Lust's fewel please the Deity.

*Dicite Pontifices, in sancto quid facis aurum?*

Speak out your minds ye Priests and do not lie,  
 Can gold your holy places sanctifie?

It's an old saying that the Church brought forth Riches, but the  
 Daughter devoured the Mother, who when she had wooden Cups she

(f) See if you please for example *Relium Instruendum*. (g) *Persus*  
*Satyrâ secundâ*.

had

had golden Priests, but afterward she got golden Cups and wooden Priests. Even their *Pseudo-Clement* (b) is prolix on this subject, exhorting the Bishop to be dis-engaged of all worldly cares and affairs, and perpetually employ'd in Preaching and Prayer, and the like Ministerial duties. And indeed all Pastors of Flocks would carefully abstain from secular and state Offices, and every thing else that may abstract them from their Charges and Flocks, least their πολυπραγμοσύνη procure them *Funnish's* reward. But if our Hierarchicks will not hear our blessed Lord and his Apostles, if they will not hear the genuine writings of the Ancients, nor yet these spurious pieces whose Authors were otherwayes sufficiently Hierarchick and Ceremonious, I think they might listen to the Bishop of *Aiace*, for he was a Member of the Council of *Trent*; *John Baptista Bernard* (faith *Suave* (i)) *Bishop of Aiace*, who, tho' he believed that *residencia* was *de jure Divino*, yet thought it not fit to speak of that question, delivered a singular speech, saying that, not aiming to establish one Opinion more than another, but only so to enforce residency, as that it may be really executed, he thought it vain to declare from whence the obligation came, or what order else and that it was sufficient only to remove the cause of Absence; which is, that Bishops do busie themselves in the courts of Princes, and in the affairs of the World, being Judges, Chancellours Secretaries, Counsellours, Treasurers, and there are but few Offices of state into which some Bishop hath not insinuate himself. This is forbidden by St. Paul, who thought it necessary that a Souldier of the Church should abstain from secular Employments. Let God's command be executed, and them forbidden to take any Charge, Office, or Degree, ordinary or extraordinary, in the affairs of the World; and then their being no cause for them to remain at Court, they will go to their residency, of their own accord, without Command or Penalty, and will not have any occasion to depart from thence. In conclusion he desired that the Council could constitute, that it should not be lawfull for Bishops or others, who have care of souls, to exercise any secular Office or Charge.

But all this was in vain, for that Synagogue of Sathan was deaf like the Adder, & the Bishop of Five Churches who harang'd to the contrary & eluded or neglected all his reasons telling the Council withall, that if *Aiace* were follow'd their Church would anon become base & contemptible, was heard with applause of the the whole Conventicle (tho' not

(b) Epist. ad Jacobum fratrem Domini. (i) his, of the Council of Trent pag. 489.

without

without a self-contradiction as the Historian observes) so that this ingenuous and Christian Discourse was slighted and contemned. Neither can I find much ground to expect any fairer treatment from men of a *Tridentine* Spirit, whose strength lyes mostly in mean sophistry, and unmanly snatching at colours and shadows, dissimulation of the unsoundness of their Cause, banter and Hectoring, noise and ill founded claims to Antiquity. From these I may look for unkind handling indeed; but withall have some assurance to meet with better dealing from all the Admirers and Students of most true and only unspotted Antiquity, the sacred Scriptures, whom God hath quicken'd by his Precepts, who know that serious and assiduous Meditation in God's Law and keeping his Precepts will make them understand more than even the Ancients, and therefore rejoyce in the Way of his Testimonies as much as in all Riches, and esteem the Words of his Mouth more than their necessary food, to whom these are the Joy and Rejoycing of their heart. These, I am somewhat confident, will not be much displeased with what I have said. My Antagonist, if any happen, or I'm exceedingly mistaken, will be of quite different Qualities. I can sincerely affirm that I have not willingly or wittingly injured the Truth, or any man's person, and that the Love of sacred Verity moved me to publish these papers. Others, doubtless, of suitable Abilities may soon advance things of far greater worth than what can come from me whose mite is so mean and inconsiderable, and who, beside the other disadvantages that environ me, according to the good Pleasure of him that doth all things well, from the very womb have laboured under the want of that noble Sense of *SEEING*, and so am oblig'd to read with the Eyes and write with the Hands of others. Yet tho' I be deprived of the sweet Light and pleasure of beholding the Sun, it little moves me, if to be I may see the infinitely more precious Light of the most glorious and dear SON of Righteousness, and be illuminated and enliven'd with that all healing Vertue which is in his Wings.

---

F I N I S.

---

